

343

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1894.

I. GOSPEL AND LAW.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, D.D.

THE original communion between God and man is the communion of love. Constituted by man's creation in the divine image, it is the principle of God's revelation of Himself in nature, in humanity, in Jesus Christ, and of all earthly and spiritual blessings bestowed on the race in its primeval state of goodness, and since its alienation from God by transgression. This original communion which, though violated, has not been abrogated by transgression, but survives hostility to Truth and the wickedness of men, is likewise the foundation of all forms of moral obligation binding men to obedience in the service of God's kingdom.

On this original communion of love Christianity is founded. A new communion it is in the Person and Mediatorship of Jesus Christ, but it neither sets aside nor supersedes that which is original. Presupposing the original communion falsified by sin, Christianity asserts it, develops and perfects it, by virtue of a new creation. The new creation in Christ constituted "in the likeness of sinful flesh" becomes, according to the law of love the atonement, which on the one hand is unifying and vivific,

and on the other a propitiation and a ransom. In one respect, the new creation in the Second Man is related to the old creation in the First Man, as the mustard tree is related to the mustard seed.

The original communion requires and justifies faith in God as manifested in the first creation. The new communion of love requires and justifies faith in God as He is manifested by the new creation in His incarnate Son. And as the new creation is the manifestation of love, new in kind, and on the plane of a human life different from and other than the plane of life on which the primeval family was fashioned, it calls forth and warrants a quality of love answering to its unique genius.

True faith in God is an active principle. In the old creation as in the new creation, it works by love. Man's love of God is responsive to God's love of man. The authority of God binding man to obey the divine law is the expression of God's love; and the will of man to yield unquestioning obedience to the divine law is the expression of man's love responsive to God. The gospel conditions the authority, the wisdom and efficiency of law. Law, genuine obedience, and the blessedness of obedience presuppose the grace and sympathy of the gospel. The formula; *thou shalt love*, becomes the fundamental formula of all God's commandments, and inspires the righteousness enjoined by both tables of the Decalogue.

I.

The law fundamental to all commandments is: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. The second commandment is subordinate, but in kind like the first: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

The formula: Thou shalt love, expresses the essence of the obligation common to both commandments.

The response toward God required of the Adamic race by divine authority is *love*. Love is the free consecration of the whole man in will and thought and feeling to God, the highest Good, a consecration which energizes and ennobles the manhood

of man. From this love is developed righteous obedience to the divine will in all the relations of social life.

That the race might be qualified in reality to make to God the response of genuine love, and in all relations honor the divine will, man by the creative word was constituted a personal being, and as personal every individual is addressed by the fundamental formula of obligation: *Thou*.

Inasmuch as God is Love, who by His creative word formed man in the image of love, designing him exclusively for the twofold communion of love with God and with his neighbor, the command enjoined by divine authority is categorical: *Thou shalt*. Says Godet: God has no higher life than that of love.

Neither age nor sex, neither learning nor culture, neither riches nor poverty, neither high rank nor obscurity, neither health nor sickness may take the place or have the force of a condition of obligation. As all men and women and children, whatever may be their environments, are personal, either in fact or in possibility, the command: *Thou shalt love*, binds all persons unconditionally, binds them to the degree and under the form that personal life exists, or has been developed.

Genuine love to man presupposes genuine love to God. Genuine love to God is rooted in the faith that confides in God. And the only faith that confides in God agreeably to God's will is the faith that recognizes and obeys God as He has revealed Himself by His Incarnate Son. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

Inasmuch as faith in Christ is an active principle, it works according to the fundamental law of all righteousness, which is expressed by the formula: *Thou shalt love*.

II.

The blessing of God freely bestowed on man precedes the expression and enforcement of divine authority. The obligation binding the conscience to obey the divine law presupposes the gifts bestowed by divine love. In other words, the commu-

nications of Love to man condition the demand of Love made upon man.

At the beginning of the sacred record of human history we are taught the truth that God made man, and that He made him in His own image. However low the plane may have been on which the first man began to live, he was constituted in principle a god-like personality. He was *man*, the unity of reason and will, not an animal. Endowed with god-like personality, he was superior to all sub-human kingdoms, and therefore was commanded to exercise dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the air and the beast of the field. Being personal, he could develop a personal history. Therefore we have a series of ethical and judicial events set before us by the pictorial representations of Genesis. Man had authority to eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; he had no authority to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The physical and moral ability to honor God by obedience was the endowment of divine love. This endowment, not subjection to authority, was the first fact of human history. When the endowment had been given it became a demand for objective authority. Then followed the law for the government of his will. Man had the ability to obey in both directions, either to eat or not to eat; ability to eat of the fruit of all the trees but one, and not to eat of the forbidden fruit. After man had been constituted a personal being the demand for law awoke. Following the endowment came the mandate and the prohibition; both came to regulate the development and culture of man's mental and moral faculties.

The Decalogue observes the same principle. First in the history of the elect people was the call of God to Abraham to depart from Ur of the Chaldees, and go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance. Connected with this call was the promise of a son by his wife Sarah, and of an innumerable posterity. Jehovah enters into covenant with Abraham, confirming it by an oath; and Abraham accepts the covenant, believing the word of Jehovah.

Then came long periods of discipline, first of Abraham, afterwards of his posterity, and a succession of blessings, prominent among which was the deliverance of the chosen people from the bondage of Egypt. Now, after these wonderful dealings with the nation whom Jehovah had chosen for Himself, follows the expression of Jehovah's authority given by the Ten Commandments. The election and the gifts of God's love precede the obligations imposed by God's love. This relation of divine blessings to the enforcement of divine authority is announced in the preface: I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

Jehovah was the God of this peculiar people. From among all other persons He had chosen Abraham to be the founder of 'a holy nation;' in Abraham, then in Isaac and Jacob, Jehovah had chosen Abraham's descendants. He had loved this people, multiplied their numbers, directed their history, delivered them from bondage, defended them against enemies, and subjected them to moral and religious discipline, as an earthly father loves his children, trains them, and supplies their needs.

For the Lord's portion is His people;
Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.
He found him in a desert land,
And in the waste howling wilderness;
He compassed him about, He cared for him,
He kept him as the apple of His eye:
As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad his wings, He took them,
He bare them on his pinions:
The Lord alone did lead him,
And there was no strange God with Him.*

Therefore His chosen people, the object of His electing love, were in turn bound to love Jehovah, to honor His name, to obey His commandments. Therefore the people needed the expression of Jehovah's will. They needed a moral law, not only as uttered by the darkened conscience, but a law definitely

* Deut. 32: 9-12.

nications of Love to man condition the demand of Love made upon man.

At the beginning of the sacred record of human history we are taught the truth that God made man, and that He made him in His own image. However low the plane may have been on which the first man began to live, he was constituted in principle a god-like personality. He was *man*, the unity of reason and will, not an animal. Endowed with god-like personality, he was superior to all sub-human kingdoms, and therefore was commanded to exercise dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the air and the beast of the field. Being personal, he could develop a personal history. Therefore we have a series of ethical and judicial events set before us by the pictorial representations of Genesis. Man had authority to eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; he had no authority to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The physical and moral ability to honor God by obedience was the endowment of divine love. This endowment, not subjection to authority, was the first fact of human history. When the endowment had been given it became a demand for objective authority. Then followed the law for the government of his will. Man had the ability to obey in both directions, either to eat or not to eat; ability to eat of the fruit of all the trees but one, and not to eat of the forbidden fruit. After man had been constituted a personal being the demand for law awoke. Following the endowment came the mandate and the prohibition; both came to regulate the development and culture of man's mental and moral faculties.

The Decalogue observes the same principle. First in the history of the elect people was the call of God to Abraham to depart from Ur of the Chaldees, and go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance. Connected with this call was the promise of a son by his wife Sarah, and of an innumerable posterity. Jehovah enters into covenant with Abraham, confirming it by an oath; and Abraham accepts the covenant, believing the word of Jehovah.

Then came long periods of discipline, first of Abraham, afterwards of his posterity, and a succession of blessings, prominent among which was the deliverance of the chosen people from the bondage of Egypt. Now, after these wonderful dealings with the nation whom Jehovah had chosen for Himself, follows the expression of Jehovah's authority given by the Ten Commandments. The election and the gifts of God's love precede the obligations imposed by God's love. This relation of divine blessings to the enforcement of divine authority is announced in the preface: I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

Jehovah was the God of this peculiar people. From among all other persons He had chosen Abraham to be the founder of 'a holy nation;' in Abraham, then in Isaac and Jacob, Jehovah had chosen Abraham's descendants. He had loved this people, multiplied their numbers, directed their history, delivered them from bondage, defended them against enemies, and subjected them to moral and religious discipline, as an earthly father loves his children, trains them, and supplies their needs.

For the Lord's portion is His people;
Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.
He found him in a desert land,
And in the waste howling wilderness;
He compassed him about, He cared for him,
He kept him as the apple of His eye:
As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad his wings, He took them,
He bare them on his pinions:
The Lord alone did lead him,
And there was no strange God with Him.*

Therefore His chosen people, the object of His electing love, were in turn bound to love Jehovah, to honor His name, to obey His commandments. Therefore the people needed the expression of Jehovah's will. They needed a moral law, not only as uttered by the darkened conscience, but a law definitely

* Deut. 32: 9-12.

pronounced in words, a law addressing them authoritatively from without as well as from within.

The giving of the Ten Commandments accordingly presupposes the special blessings of Jehovah experienced in the entire history of the chosen nation, extending through centuries of discipline.

Obedience to the Ten Commandments was not the condition of Jehovah's love, not the condition of Jehovah's recognition of the nation as His chosen people; but the election and blessing of Jehovah was the condition of the obligation binding this people, in contradistinction from all other nations, to obey the moral and ceremonial law. If the posterity of Abraham had not been the chosen people, if Jehovah had not with a mighty hand brought them out of the house of bondage, delivering them from subjection to Pharaoh, they would not have received the Ten Commandments. To a degree they were fitted to obey the righteous will of Jehovah, and, therefore, they were honored with the formal expression of His righteous will. Otherwise this branch of the Semitic race would have occupied the plane on which all Gentiles stood—would have continued to be counted among those who, 'having no law, are a law unto themselves.'

The law, whether moral or ceremonial, fulfills a twofold purpose:

1. Law has a negative force. *Moral* law, by the enforcement of authority, enjoining righteous love and forbidding transgression, is a restraint upon irreligion, and upon the wickedness springing from human passion; it provokes the development of the strength of natural depravity, and begets the knowledge of sin. Says Paul: "Sin, finding occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of coveting; for apart from the law sin is dead." *Ceremonial* law built a wall of partition and separation between the elect people and the Gentile world, being designed both for protection against the errors and sins of paganism, and for religious culture.

2. Law has a positive force. *Moral* law answers the question: What is the right? or, what is the wrong? It

becomes, as it is designed to be, a guide for and a support to religious life and social conduct. Presuming confidence in God and a disposition to honor His authority, moral law is regulative of the obedience which fulfills the design of Jehovah's electing love. *Ceremonial* law is the prefiguration and prophesy of the coming Messiah; cultivating confidence and hope in God.

Both purposes of the law were necessary; necessary that the elect people, by nature sinful, oppressed by the moral ignorance that sinfulness produces, and surrounded by the idolatry and superstition of pagan nations, might awake to see the light of the Messianic promise, and cultivate a righteousness of life answerable, in some degree, to the demands of divine love and the demands of man's God-likeness.

III.

The relation of God's blessing to man's obligation of obedience which addresses us from the first chapters of Genesis is prophetic of the covenant relation of Jehovah with Abraham.

And the election of Abraham's posterity to be the chosen people of Jehovah, in their relations to the mandates of the Decalogue, is prophetic of the relation between grace and law, between blessing and obligation in Christianity.

Our Lord sums up the import of the moral and the ceremonial law in two principles: love to God, and love to my neighbor. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

The love of God revealed in choosing Abraham and his seed to be His peculiar people, is prophetic of the larger love of God revealed by the election of His Only-begotten Son to be the life and salvation of the world.

By the mediatorship of Jesus Christ the true relation of the blessing of God to the obligation of man, of God's love to man's obedience, is manifested and established under its final form. The only begotten Son is the Gift of all gifts. His advent conditions the possibility of the profoundest response from human personality, such as neither God's goodness in

nature or Providence, nor God's electing love toward the people of Israel was designed or was able to call forth.

The revelation of the unfathomable love of God accomplished by the words and deeds, by the self-sacrifice and victory over death, of the Mediator, originates the new obligation of man to love God with all his heart. This obligation becomes at the same time the possibility of positive response.

First in order is the coming of God in the tenderness and sympathy of mercy to a world in moral ruin. The Son of Man lives a perfectly righteous life; He fulfills the will of His Father's love in all things; He resolves death into eternal life; and overcomes the realm of darkness, bringing victory and immortality to light. Therefore the obligation follows, binding to obedience the conscience and will of every man to whom the gospel says: Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore the invitation of grace for all nations becomes possible and necessary: Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

This sublime Blessing is the surety of all other needful blessings: He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things. The sinful and unworthy are the objects of sympathy; the guilty, the objects of grace.

The Gift of all gifts freely bestowed begets the moral necessity of accepting the Gift. From this relation of mercy and grace into which, by His Incarnate Son, God has come to stand with fallen mankind, arises an obligation of faith and service which is imperative and unconditional. The objects of unfathomable love are bound to love God, 'who is most worthy of love,' as God in Christ has loved them, 'who are most unworthy.'

Of the two-fold sum of the Law, love to God and love to man, Jesus Christ is the impersonation. What the nature of divine love is we learn by the study of His self-sacrifice. What the true human love of God is and requires we learn by contemplating His perfect obedience. In Him two opposite

things are to be seen : the most perfect revelation of the nature and requirements of law, and the most perfect fulfillment of that obedience which the law unconditionally commands. Hence the Lord Jesus Christ is the concrete law, not the law written in words, but the realization of the divine will in His deeds.

Of the Edenic prohibition the ethical import is seen in His fixed aversion to all forms of wrong-doing. Of the Ten Commandments, considered positively as well as negatively, the profound spiritual requirements were brought to light by His personality, and were fulfilled by His righteous life. What the Decalogue enjoins on God's people and what it forbids, addresses us most clearly and forcibly from the realization of the Decalogue consummated by His unique history.

Being the absolute revelation of the authority of Law and at the same time the absolute fulfillment of Law, Christ becomes for us the embodiment of the relation which divine blessing sustains to human obedience, the relation which grace bears to law. From love to our fallen race, the Son of God assumes human nature into union with Himself; and human nature, by virtue of this assumption, in the person of the Son of Man is bound by divine law to and is qualified for absolute obedience. This unique truth sets before us the reciprocal connection between the gospel and the law.

He gave Himself for us and to us; therefore we are bound to give ourselves to Him. To use the words of another: "The recompense of love is to love perfectly." We love, because He first loved us. He, enthroned in Heaven, is ever active in our behalf, is ever imparting of the fulness of His life to us; therefore we are qualified and obligated to live a life after the pattern of His self-sacrifice for men, and His devotion to God.

In other words, the genius of the gospel precedes law, and conditions obligation; obedience to the authority of law fulfills the necessities of the gospel. The principle pervading the whole history of Messianic revelation that the gifts of love originate obligation, attains to its noblest embodiment and most

complete expression in the divine-human history of the ideal Man.

The obligation imposed by God by the gift of His Son incarnate is the strongest obligation. It binds the conscience of all men by the authority of a Law which is fundamental to all divine and human laws. What Hooker says of God is valid in its application to the God-man: "The being of God is a kind of law to His working; for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that He doeth." * In Christ the blessing of God to fallen mankind, and the obligation of responsive obedience have become one reality. Christ, the concrete gospel, has the authority of inviolable law; Christ, the concrete law, exemplifies the ethical ends of the gospel.

IV.

Jesus Christ, the perfect impersonation of the authority of law and of obedience to law, fulfills the negative and positive purposes both of the Decalogue and of the ceremonial economy. And when we accept Jesus Christ and take refuge in Him, when we follow Him, bearing His cross, and obey the new commandment to love one another as He has loved us, we fulfill the purpose of all divine laws.

Of human judgment respecting the right and the wrong, He is the criterion. His personal life is the Right in the concrete. The voluntary thoughts, words and deeds that either contravene or fail to conform to this standard are the wrong. His personality becomes the guide for the moral judgment, both of the Christian Church and of the world, on all questions.

Inasmuch as His personal history is the realization of Law, the authority of His ideal life conditions the true knowledge of sin; and the knowledge of sin conditions the genuine sense of guilt.

When Jesus Christ, the embodiment of the new commandment, reveals Himself by His Spirit, sin revives and men die. The commandment, which is unto life, 'the natural man' finds to

* Hooker's Works, Vol. I., Bk. I., Ch. 2, 2.

be unto death ; for sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiles him, and through it slays him. The law is holy, and righteous, and good. But sin, that it may be shown to be sin, works death to the natural man through that which is good ; that through the commandment sin may become exceeding sinful.*

From such positive knowledge of Christ, who is the absolute authority of Truth, is begotten the *μετάνοια* set forth and enjoined by the New Testament.

If the correctness of these premises be conceded, it will follow that the law-work, as it has been termed, which enters into the experience of the returning 'prodigal,' is most effectually accomplished, not by enforcing the mandatory authority of the Decalogue, much less by picturing its minatory terrors, but by proclaiming the Truth of all truths ; for than this there is no authority higher and more commanding, none that can authenticate itself with such direct, penetrating force to the conscience, being 'sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit.'

Our Lord honors the Ten Commandments and the ceremonial law ; but He does not recognize either as final authority. Instead, He rectifies and enlarges the traditional interpretations of the Jews.

Moreover, it deserves to be noted that Christ does not lay stress on the enforcement of the obligations of the moral law in order to move the Jews to acknowledge Him to be the Messiah. Instead, He proclaims Himself to be the fulfiller of the law, the One who is 'greater than the temple,' who is 'Lord of the Sabbath,' and the supreme Judge.

The means by which all men are to be moved to take refuge in the Son of Man is none other than Himself. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." To Christian *μετάνοια* He, not the Decalogue, is the Motive of all motives.

* Rom. 7: 7-13.

II.

THE RIGHT OF DISPOSAL BY TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR JACOB COOPER, S.T.D., D.C.L., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

THERE has been wide diversity of opinion whether property should be disposed by Testament; and among those who admit the Right, the Mode of its exercise has been equally varied. At a time when the most carefully drawn wills and those most reasonable and beneficent in their provisions are so frequently set aside on every sort of flimsy pretext, it seems pertinent to discuss the Rights of Testamentary Disposal, and if this be grounded in nature and equity to enforce the demand that the testator's wishes be respected.

The history of opinion shows that those nations which were at any given period farthest advanced in civilization had the best defined ideas on this subject and most positive convictions in favor of the right; and that the same peoples in different ages manifested a growing recognition of this right and its bearing on their progress proportioned to their general culture and development of political justice. Accordingly, where the influence of Divine Revelation shows the most perfect civilization through the power of revealed truth in moulding ethical ideas, we find the enactments of statute law recognizing more and more fully the right of each man to bestow that which he justly holds, according to his pleasure; whether the disposition be made to take effect while he is busy in the affairs of life, or when he can have no further use of his possessions. Hence we infer that the approximation between the prevalence of the sense of Right on this subject and the most perfect culture of our race, points unmistakeably to the fact that this is grounded in our

nature, and being natural is inseparable from our highest development.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE SUBJECT.

The earliest Bill of Rights is the Mosaic Economy, and in this Legation, as we have the oldest, so, without doubt, the most perfect system of government found in antiquity. The right to dispose by Testament is both commanded as a matter of personal obligation,* and recognized as an established usage.† In fact the whole religious system of the Hebrews was largely dependent on the tenure of property and its transmission through the devise of the testator. The tribal relation, the temple worship, and the permanence of the national life, rested almost exclusively on the inviolability of testamentary bequests.

The Islamic lawgiver accepts the right of Devise as unquestioned.‡ This is because it had been an established usage among the Arabians from the earliest ages of their existence in the tribal relation. This, doubtless, had the same origin through their progenitor Ishmael that the Hebrew law had from the Abrahamic covenant. As this system of law formulated in the Qu'rân has been the rule of action for a large and cultivated part of the human race, its teaching on our subject is important, adding to the consensus its positive testimony. There we find substantially the germs of the common law on wills; and the simplicity of the Arabic practice might be profitably imitated in our own legislation.§

Among the Greeks and Romans the common law regulating Devise by Testament existed prior to the legislation of Solon and the Twelve Tables. For these are merely the formal and authoritative expression of well-established usage. For no law can approve itself to the public conscience, and gain a foothold merely by arbitrary enactment, until the need is felt, and the way prepared for it by the practice of something like it. Hence the assertion of Plutarch,|| that no devise of property was pro-

* Gen. xv. 3-4. † Gen. xxv. 5; xlviii. 42, *et passim*. ‡ Qu'rân, V. Sur, 105, Ed. Palmer. § Qu'rân IV. Sur 4-15 and 175, Ed. Palmer. || Vit. Solon.

vided for prior to the legislation of Solon, refers to the provisions of the specific code, and not to the right itself of making a Testament. For in this legislation the fact is assumed both as of right and usage prior to this time. This is evident both from the *Alcestis* of Euripides* and Sophocles' *Trachinæ*,† and many other references which might be cited. We have evidence, moreover, that antecedent to the earliest written records, this usage prevailed in the form of nuncupative wills; which, in the absence of writing, were the only kind possible. Thus Telemachus‡ assumed the right as one firmly established to make an Ambulatory Testament. This usage, however, was reduced to system by Solon§ in his code for the Athenians, which recognized and enforced the right of Devise even in cases where a man had no legitimate children. The provisions were such as the laws of nature dictate for the disposition of property, save that daughters were not allowed an equal status with sons.|| But this was according to the genius of their civilization in the treatment of women who were deemed inferiors. The sons shared equally; and while their sisters had no rights by testament, except in default of brothers or their male issue, the brothers were obliged to give them dowry. In case there was no male issue the daughters inherited, but subject to restrictions which were onerous, and often unjust.¶ For their father had power in devising to them, if devise it could be called, to interpose arbitrary conditions, compelling them to marry kinsmen of certain grades, whether this was agreeable or not; and in default of compliance they were excluded from the succession. Yet the general principle of a natural right to devise was clearly recognized by the great extent of authority allowed in making a will. For this was, in effect, unlimited; unless it could be proved that the testator had been unduly influenced in discarding those who were his heirs according to the ties of nature.

* *Alcestis*, 1020. † *Trachinæ*, 156. ‡ *Odyssey*, xvii. 79 *et seq.* § *Plutarch*, *Vit. Sol.* 20-21. || *Grote*, *Hist. Gr.*, vol. iii. 138-2. ¶ *Vid. Bunsen*, *De Jure Hered. Athen.*, p. 29.

This full liberty of bequest was thought productive of good by encouraging industry and the accumulation of property. For, as Plutarch says of Solon: τὰ χρήματα κτήματα τῶν ἐχόντων ἐποίσεν.* This expresses concisely the fact that no property in its complete signification can exist, unless absolute possession, which includes untrammelled right of disposal, be guaranteed.

Coming next to the Twelve Tables, we find the same right secured. The provisions of the Fifth Table were amplified and defined in the course of years until they formed one of the most extensive and intricate of all the departments of the Civil Law. There was, however, a strong spirit of opposition to the practice of making wills developed both at Athens and Rome, in consequence of its outrageous abuse; partly by the interference of legacy hunters, who unduly influenced the mind of the testator, and partly owing to the imperfection of the law touching heiresses. The former abuse grew out of the mode of life by which the master of the house was isolated from his near kindred, and consequently left at the mercy of flatterers, who by devoted attention won the confidence of him whose mind and body were failing. The latter, however, was inseparable from the inferior position of women before the law; a wrong which is so inveterate that even Christian civilization has not fully eradicated it.

The forging of wills was very common at Athens in her most flourishing era, as is clear from the Orations of Isæus, many of which were occupied with the exposure of this very crime. In truth, so rampant did the evil become that, while the right of testamentary disposal was not called in question, its abuse was so prevalent, that its exercise was looked upon by many wise men as of doubtful expediency because its true intent and power were thwarted. (*Vide* Isæus' Orations, with Sir Wm. Jones' Com., *passim*.) That the like condition of things, perhaps even aggravated, prevailed at Rome is clearly shown by the frequent reference in the satirists and comedians to tuft hunters and the forging of wills. The latter became a regular

* Vit. Sol. 21.

business, and reckoned among its practitioners many whose shrewdness equalled their villainy. Hence it became one of the chief points to which Roman legislators and civilians directed their attention, to so protect testamentary right by special safeguards that it could not be abused by forgers and legacy hunters who had become a recognized profession.* Yet the very multitude of provisions necessary to effect a valid testament became so great that it was extremely difficult to comply with the exact letter of the law, and the necessity of compliance reacted against its employment. Thus a mitigation in the strictness of the provisions became indispensable in the case of soldiers in the field. There were not a few other instances where the strictness of the letter could not be easily met, or where the surroundings of the testator made this less necessary.† When Roman civilization penetrated among the barbarous nations of northern Europe it found no legal provisions for testamentary bequest. Tacitus says, *Germania* XX.: *Hæredes tamen successorresque sui cuique liberi; et nullum testamentum. Si liberi non sunt, proximus gradus in possessione fratres, patrui, avunculi.* Thus the right of Devise is shown to be natural among them, being exercised in all its essential features before these were enumerated and enforced by any written code. To a much later period the same was true of Gaul and Britain. But where there was no means of writing, the power to make a will would be limited to Nuncupative; and in a rude state of society where all laws are imperfectly enforced, the exercise of devise would be called for more seldom, and, of course, less rigidly enforced. Yet, as we see, the natural course of succession was accepted; and this continued to be confirmed by usage until, with the advance in knowledge, the more accurate methods of expressing the testator's desire were discovered, and greater certainty of enforcing this was possible. Similar progress may be seen everywhere among uncivilized nations in the development of legal ideas. In the old laws of the Hindoos there is evidence of a state of things similar to that which existed

* Vide Inst. II. 10, § 4-5. Dig. 28, Tit. I., Code 6, 39, et al. † Digest, 29. Tit. I.

before the Legislation of Solon and the XII. Tables.* But all these cases prove no more, against the devise by Testament, than any of the clearest rights of human society. Essential and natural rights exist and gradually come into use long before they are formulated into a code.† For general laws are potential and are applied by common consent long before they are defined by the legislator, just as language is formed and used before the grammarian and the Academy publish their rules of syntax. The code of Justinian accepts the right of Devise without questioning its validity. It is there treated as a Natural Right, though like other similar ones to be regulated by the civil law. From this code the chief nations of continental Europe, and their colonies in all parts of the civilized world, have borrowed their systems, with such modifications as were suitable to the spirit of their institutions. The Feudal System interfered materially with testamentary powers. For it destroyed the right of private property by investing it in the Baron or Lord of the Manor. Here the necessity of preserving large estates intact, so as to afford the means of self-preservation in troublous times, introduced the principle of entail, which substantially destroyed the right of bequest. Yet, despite this drawback to national growth and unity, there has been a constant tendency to return to the practice of the Civil Law with its clear definition of natural right. Germany has shown her wisdom in accepting this code, and making it the foundation of her municipal and common law. France, which held on to entail with great persistence, cut loose from this together with most other inveterate corruptions, in the convulsions of the Revolution. To get rid of entail, a law was enacted permitting the devise of a part of the estate. This was a step in the right direction, but it stopped short of entire testamentary freedom. In Britain the right of devise, while fully acknowledged, is greatly interfered with by the law of the Realm, and by special applications arising from local usage. It is true that before the Conquest,

* Halhed, Preface to the Gentoo Code, p. 3. † Vid. Morey, Roman Law Int.

lands were devisable by will, yet through the introduction of military tenure at that time, the right, as applicable to real property, was for a long period practically annulled. The rigor of this system was mitigated somewhat by the Doctrine of Uses; but it was not until the Statute of Wills 32 and 34, supplemented by 35, Cap. 5, of Henry VIII., that the common law became uniform on this subject. But, while the right of Devise was accepted as an unquestioned principle of natural and statute law, still Borough Usage and Entail caused this to be one of the most perplexing parts of English jurisprudence until the Statute I. Victoria, 26, which removed all restrictions, save Entail, from the Devise of every species of property. In the United States this right is unquestioned, and as simple and nearly untrammelled as any matter of common or statute law. It is with us as clearly defined as in the Athenian code, and less intricate than in the Digest of Justinian.

This brief summary of the history shows the general tendency of opinion concerning the right of Testamentary Devise from the legislation of Moses and the other early codes down to the present time. It has been recognized from "the time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary"; and we have seen that the freedom of Devise from restrictions has always been proportioned to the civilization of the people, and measured their progress in material prosperity.

The inquiry which constitutes our subject is next in order. Upon what is the Right of Devise founded? Is it a Natural Right, or the creature of Municipal Law?

ALLEGED BASIS OF THE RIGHT.

There is much confusion in common language in regard to what is meant by municipal rights as opposed to natural. It would be much more accurate to say that the Statute is the development of the Right, than that the Right is founded upon the Statute. For unless the Right existed either in *esse* or in *potestate* no enactment looking to the good of the governed could create it. For the entire province of government is to consult

the welfare of the subject, and this can be effected only by defining and enforcing the rights which grow out of the constitution of human nature. And this becomes necessary when, in the progress of society from barbarism towards civilization—or to state the case more accurately, in the advance from simple patriarchal life among the first inhabitants of the earth to the society of the State—new relations arise, growing out of the increase of population with the multiplication of mutual interests and duties. We must not forget that the province of Law is declarative, and not creative, in the enactment of statutes. For until the relations of men show the legislation to be needful there is no occasion for the enactment of statutes; since this would be merely to express in theory what cannot yet be reduced to practice. The definition of Law: “A rule of action prescribed by a superior power,” is correct when applied to the Divine commandments. It is also true of human legislation as the expression of that power which is surrendered by the individual to a representative, who exercises it for the common good of society. But to conceive of Law as a power to create a Right, instead of being the instrument to give it expression, is as inaccurate as to assert that grammar creates language. Human law is a discovery not an invention; and its application in practice antedates its recognition in a code. Hence the obscurity surrounding the early history of any general law.* Blackstone is undoubtedly wrong when he says, Book II, Chap. I, p. 11: “It is certainly a wise and effectual, but clearly a political establishment, since the permanent right of property vested in the ancestor himself was no natural, but merely a civil right.” For man existed and both possessed and had to exercise rights before there was any civil government either to create or define them. By virtue of his creation, and endowment by the Creator with the right of eminent domain over the earth, he became possessed of as much as he could employ and control. And the rights of which he was seized he could transfer, else there could be no business intercourse. Pliny.

* 422' del note

ζῆ ταῦτα, κούδεις οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου ᾿φάνη.—Soph. Antig. 456-7.

Lib. 5, Epist. 7, puts the case much better than Blackstone: *Mihi autem defuncti voluntas (vereor quam in partem I'oti quod dicturus sum accipiant) antiquior jure est.* And in accordance with this view, Grotius says: (*De Jure Nat. et Gent. II. 14*), *Quanquam enim testamentum, ut actus alii, formam certam accipere passit a jure civile, ipsa tamen ejus substantia cognita est dominio; et eo dato, juris naturalis.* Undoubtedly the right of Devise rests upon the same principle which makes valid the claim to dispose of property in any way. For if the possession of goods enables us to bestow them upon whom we please during life, then the mere approach of death does not destroy that right so long as the possessor is *compos mentis*. As Huber says:* *Naturali Juri consentaneum esse ut voluntas domini rem suam in alium transferentis sit rata. Quod si in quotidianis, ut ibi, contractibus, naturali ratione fiat, nulla ratio est cur non æque suprema morituri hominis voluntate dominia rerum transferentis abeundi jus ex potestate domini oritur, quæ in ultimo vitæ articulo non minor est quam dudum.* Quintilian had said long before:† *Potest grave fieri etiam ipsum patrimonium, si non integrum legere habet, et cum omne jus nobis in id permittatur viventibus, auferatur morientibus.* But Puffendorf, who has been followed by many writers on the philosophy of Law, is doubtful whether the right of Devise is a natural one or the creation of civil enactment. For, in referring to the opinion of Grotius (*vide supra*) he says:‡ *Circa quam assertionem non potest multum dubium moveri. Nam cum res illae quarum dominium est introductum vivis hominibus inserviant, ad mortuos autem res humanæ nihil amplius attineant; igitur non facultatem disponendi quid circa res alicujus post mortem debeat fieri.* But if this doctrine be true, the property of a dying man ceases to be owned by any person. For as his dominion ceases with his life, and he cannot transfer that dominion *mortis causa*, it reverts to the condition of nature; and so may be appropriated by any one who comes along. For, according to the principle

* *De Jure Civitatis, Lib. IV, D. Cap. XXIX.* † Quintilian, *P. in Dec.*

‡ *De Jure Nat. et Gent. Lib. IV, Cap. 10, § 4.*

laid down in the Digest, XLI. 1, 3. *Quod enim nullius est, id ratione naturali occupanti conceditur.* This view of the cessation of dominion gave rise to the principle stated by Blackstone, II: 1, that, as a man's children or nearest relatives are most likely to be closest to his dying bed and therefore are the first to know of his death, they would step in and take possession of his estate. By doing so the usage gradually ripened into a law; as among the Germans we are told by Tacitus (Ger. XX.): *Haeredes tamen successoresque sui cuique liberi.* This, however, makes the succession depend wholly upon chance, and not upon right or any fixed principle. For the owner might die suddenly among strangers, who being near would thereby become his heirs. Or, he might die entirely alone and then no one would succeed to his estate. Violence or trickery might displace the children and other relatives in anticipation of the owner's death, and thus, by worse than highway robbery, usurp the right. This theory is absurd, and makes the right of succession wholly contingent.

A somewhat more rational theory of the right of Divise was advanced by Leibnitz,* who held that this is based on the Immortality of the Soul. *Testamenta*, says he, *mero jure nullius momenti nisi anima esset immortalis. Sed quia mortui revera adhuc vivunt, ideo manent domini rerum; quos vero haeredes relinquunt, concipiendi procuratores in rem suam.* But it is marvelous that so powerful and acute a reasoner as Leibnitz could deceive himself with this fiction. For the continued existence of a man could have no reference to his rights on earth except this were still his sphere of activity. Unless it could be made to appear that he is still present, and takes a personal share in the doings of men, his existence in an essentially different life could have no influence and no right to control that which confessedly belongs to this. For each life has its appropriate duties, and if the soul takes cognizance of what was left behind we have no means of knowing its will unless that be declared to us. But when we know the will of

* *Nova Methodos Jurisprudentiae*, Leibnitz Opera, p. 56, Ed Erdmann.

the testator while he was the owner and occupant, and while he shared in the business of life, this is a reasonable indication to guide us in the disposition of property whose entire dominion was confessedly vested in him.

THE TRUE BASIS OF THE RIGHT.

But the proof which we deem conclusive to show that a man has the natural right to say what disposition shall be made of his property after his death, is derived from the analogy which there is in the order of nature between the permanency of his actions and his wishes. This is a method of proof which, so far as our reading extends, has never been advanced by any writer on this subject. Arguments drawn from the influence which the power of Devise exerts on the character of the devisor in stimulating him to activity and virtue in the accumulation of property to be enjoyed by those whom he loves, or employed in advancing great public charities for which he has labored, and from the hope of founding a family and honorable name—these reasons are used by political philosophers to prove the expediency of the right. But they do not touch the core of the question, that is the foundation of the right in nature. Besides, they leave out of view the strongest of all arguments: the facts that a man's will, and the actions growing out of his will, do live and remain in full vigor after the death of his body. As in the natural, so in the moral world, no power is lost. It is part of a sequence of influences the end of which will never be reached until men cease to live on earth. If one man by a course of honest and well-directed industry, builds up a fortune, this remains to do a good work after his death. "He has ceased from his labors, but his works do follow him." The monuments of literature and philosophy will continue larger than the Pyramids. We justify the self-laudation of Horace.* The influence of a noble example can never be lost, whether expressed in rearing a family or moulding a state. If a man by the force of his character founds a great commonwealth, as

* *Exegi monumentum ære perennius, Car. III, 30.*

did Peter of Russia, Alfred of England, or Washington, their wills put forth in the formative process are projected beyond the period of their natural lives, and are as efficient still as while they acted in person among their fellows. The influence of the Founder of Christianity upon the moral culture of the world, of Aristotle on subsequent philosophical speculation, or of Justinian on the administration of law, could not be ignored without blotting out the greatest part of the world's history. Nothing can be more certain than that in the case of every man who has ever lived with a purpose consecrated to the good of the world, that "he being dead yet speaketh." The formation of character by education is expected to effect its greatest influence after the death of the teacher. In short, wherever actions are the result of rational will, they carry that will beyond the life of their author as perfectly as while he moved on earth. In truth, the fact of his life or death does not of itself effect the least change on the measure of his influence, unless it be to increase this by the sense of love and gratitude which the remembrance of a benefactor deceased has upon the survivor.

Hence, whether men desire this or not, their wills, expressed in words, in character, or in material results, make themselves felt, and so are independent of all statutes. They are a part of the order of nature prevailing with the inevitable sequence of cause and effect. If, then, we see as an incontrovertible fact that the will of a deceased man is living and efficient in the order of natural law, it must be that it is a part of his constitution to influence the world by his determination as certainly after his death as while he was in the full play of personal activities. This will being inseparable from his personality as an actual fact on earth, it cannot be the creature of statute. Hence the assertion of Puffendorf is incorrect where he says, L. iv: 4, "*Deinde cum mortui rebus humanis exempti sint; impune ipsorum voluntas ac dispositio vivis adhuc facta, videbatur posse negligi.*" For this more important disposition made by their influence on society can neither be neglected nor successfully

resisted. Hence we conclude that the right of making and publishing a formal testament rests on the same sure basis, and is therefore a natural prerogative.

Proceeding from this foundation as the warrant for making a testament, we come next to the right which grows out of dominion. It has been questioned whether the right of property is a natural one or only the creature of municipal law arising from the necessities of the social compact. The divine warrant, Gen. i: 28, it has been held, conveyed only the usufruct, and did not include dominion. And, as the usufruct could only continue while a man lived, his possession must necessarily cease at his death, and the property held by him become *res nullius*. But if this were true, there could be no such thing as permanency of ownership, and the world must undergo a perpetual redistribution. If possession comprehended no more than a life lease, then all that would be necessary in order to dispossess a man of his estate would be to take his life. This is the doctrine of anarchy pure and simple, and would exactly suit thieves and murderers, who would destroy society by leveling all down to themselves. Jezebel, when she procured the stoning of Naboth, took not only the short and easy, but the lawful method of gaining possession of the coveted vineyard. The idle and vicious claim that all possession derived from honest labor of the person himself, or his progenitors, is wrong; and show that they are prevented from dispossessing the owner merely by the strength of the occupant or the arm of the law which protects him. But if possession ceased as soon as the rightful owner was dead no matter how his death was brought about, the property would fall to the occupant first on the scene—which would, of course, be the murderer. If it be said that the law must protect the possessor and punish the intruder, this would not prevent the possession ceasing as soon as the former occupant was killed; and if the murderer was punished for his crime, then, after his execution, the property lapses into a state of nature. If it be asserted that the State becomes trustee for the ownership and will see that it passes to the proper heir,

there are new difficulties which meet us. For where does the State get its claim? It is itself the creature of the people. They existed and had their rights, in *case* at least, before they combined, and the only object of this political combination was for mutual protection, so that their essential rights may be expressed and enforced when they became potential. Hence it is clear that the State has nothing but what was given to it in the first place, and therefore can have no more dominion over the property of the citizen than he had himself. In fact, it has no power but what is delegated from necessity to make it the organ of administration for the good of the governed. This is equally true under whatever form we contemplate the State, whether under monarchy or a republic. The emperor or king, if divinely appointed, is the impersonation of right and power, not for himself or created by himself; he is the expression of those delegated forces which men, in obedience to their divinely illuminated consciences, and their sense of personal security and happiness, cause to centre in their sovereign. This is at first sight more clear in a representative government, but in its last analysis the monarchy resolves itself into the choice by which men accept as their champion that one who has protected them from wild beasts or hostile neighbors. In either case, the ruling power is the instrument by which the rights actually possessed can be most conveniently enforced.

It is plain, then, that the usufruct is not enough to constitute dominion. There must be a real ownership of property, so that one person has absolute possession of it to the exclusion of all others. But this dominion cannot exist apart from the right of transference according to the wish of the owner.* But where does this ownership rest? Is it with the State which holds the property as guardian of the occupant? This, as we have seen, cannot be, because the State is the creature of the citizens, and is made up exclusively of the powers which they delegate. If we admit that the State becomes the real owner at the time when there is a change of usufruct, that it steps in at the interregnum

* Mill, Pol. Econ., Book II, Chap. II, § 4.

as the receptacle of dominion to say whose the usufruct shall next be, and so puts a new owner in possession, then the question of expediency arises: Is it best for the interests of both parties that the State should wield this authority? One of the strongest incentives to energy and industry in the accumulation of wealth will be taken away if the right of devise be not maintained.* For he that acquires can have at best only a partial ownership. His title is not complete, because he can do as he pleases with it only for the period of his life.† He has no assurance that it will not go to persons for whom he has no regard, or for objects which he disapproves. On the other hand, the disposition cannot be so just or discriminating by the State, by any third party, as by the man himself, who knows what each heir deserves or needs, and is most likely to make a proper use of the bequest.‡ The fundamental rule of good government is to interfere as little as possible with the subject, and hence receive the smallest delegated power consistent with its proper functions; for it is a self-evident principle that each man must, on the whole, know best what is for his own welfare. And hence in all cases its authority should be declarative and executive of the natural rights of the subject, since it has been made merely the receptacle of those rights.

THE RIGHT OF DISPOSAL BY TESTAMENT.—PART II.

Holding the power of devise as an absolute natural right pertaining to each person who possesses property, and inseparable from the idea of dominion, it follows from the constitution of society that this right must be relative in its application. The same is true, however, of every one of those rights which the individual member of society possesses; for, as men are united by common interests, in order to secure protection, they must surrender a part of their liberty in every matter which concerns the common welfare. They no longer exist exclusively in their individual relations, but as members of one common body;

* Kent's Com., Pt. 6, p. 502. † Blackstone, Book 2, Chap. I. ‡ Mill, Pol. Econ., Book V, Chap. XI., § 7.

hence they must surrender as much of their personal liberty as is necessary for the welfare of the community, and must retain so much as is conducive to their own highest interests. Accordingly, while the right of testamentary devise remains intact, yet, as each person is dependent on the law regulating the community, and which must enforce his will after his death, he is under the necessity of disposing his estate in such a way as not to interfere with the well-being of that society of which he ceases to be a personal participant. This is altogether reasonable, for the law being the expression of the common conception of justice which the deceased once had a share in forming, he cannot complain if compelled to conform his particular preferences to the general will in a matter to be managed after his death, just as he was required while living by the terms of his membership in the civil compact.

RATIONAL DEVISE OF PROPERTY.

The natural disposition of property is that the possessor should devise it to his children, or in default of these to his nearest of blood. For the offspring have a claim on those who brought them into being, which is stronger than that which any other heir can offer. This, which is clearly the law of nature, is also sanctioned by Divine Revelation: "Parents should lay up for their children." * Indeed, it is a principle well established, having its roots in common sense that children should not be brought into the world without suitable provision being made for their maintenance.† So, if it is an imperative obligation that parents should, during their own lives, take care of those for whose existence they are responsible, when death deprives them of the power to fulfill this duty personally, they are bound in anticipation to provide for its continuance by the only method which is possible.

Hence children succeed as a rule to the possessions of their parents by the law of nature. This right the municipal law has always recognized as reasonable in itself, and enforced because

* 2 Cor. xii. 12.

† Mill, *Pol. Econ.*, B. II, Chap. II, §3

of its influence on the welfare of society. Hence, according to the spirit of the law, children take possession, not because they happen to be by the death-bed of the prior occupant, and know first of his decease—which facts enable them before any one else to enter upon the estate and continue the occupancy—but because by descent the natural right is inherent in them, no matter where they may be when the dominion is changed. For, as they inherit physically and morally the characteristics of their parents, so all the external possessions accrue to them by descent for reasons equally founded in nature, and which find expression in all codes taking cognizance of the true conditions of the social compact.

The natural affection of parents towards children has always been considered a sufficient safeguard in itself for the proper disposition of the estate without any interposition of the law to foster and direct it. Hence the provisions enacted by the codes of enlightened nations have been merely tutelary, to guard a principle which underlies the roots of the code itself. The legislation of Solon directed that sons should inherit the property equally; and if there were daughters also, to give each of them dowry out of the personalty. But, in case there were daughters only, while they inherited equally, yet they were required to marry according to certain specified conditions. The same provisions are found substantially in the Legation of Moses, which is the basis of all Jewish and Islamic regulations touching the inheritance of daughters. These provisions did not question their right of inheritance which was distinctly admitted, but arose from a belief in the helplessness of women to guard their own interests. This is clearly stated by Gaius * as the reason why the law had kept them under tutelage, though he disapproves of this view; and in practice woman became to a greater degree free from disabilities on account of sex. This tendency, though slow, is manifest in history; and it seems likely that at no distant day in all enlightened codes there will be entire parity between the sexes, both of right of inheritance and devise.

* Gaius' Inst., § 190.

If there were no children, the testator could leave his property to whom he pleased, according to the Athenian and Roman codes, provided there was no undue influence exerted by legacy hunters. The corrupt measures employed to secure the devise and the forgery of wills were so frequent that the evil became perilous to society. For this reason the power to devise was held by many to be productive of more evil than good. Nay, even so overwhelming became this abuse that it was held to be the great cause of corruption in morals at Athens and the ruin of the commonwealth. But this was a clear case of the logical fallacy of *non causa pro causa*. The morals had become thoroughly depraved, else such an abuse were not possible. So at Rome the Heredipetæ were a constant subject of taunt for the satirists. (*Vid.* Hor. Sat., II : 5 ; Plin. Epist., IV : 15 ; Juvenal, XII : 95 ; Tac. Ann., XIII : 52 ; Martial, IV : 56.) But this evil become so great that it wrought its own cure in giving rise to the numerous and accurate formulæ which must be observed before a will became valid according to the code. Yet in all the efforts to prevent abuses the right of devise was not questioned, but rather a persistent determination shown to know what was the real will of the devisor. For the abuse of the right arose not from the nature of the right itself, but from the imperfection of law, inseparable from any human ordinance, and more than all from the corruption of morals which permitted a lax enforcement. Moreover, these abuses could be multiplied the more easily when the number who could write was small, and so the counterfeiting of all kinds of instruments more likely to escape detection.

This brings us to the consideration of the Testament as an acknowledged Right under the Civil Law. For here it is found in its most specific form, defined by the most accurate terms, and hedged about with the strictest safeguards that have ever been employed by any people. As an integral part of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, itself one of the most perfect of human devices, it is well nigh complete in its scope and accuracy. The only objection to it as an embodiment of justice touching

the right of Devise is the discrimination which it makes against the female sex. Compared with the rights of men those of women under the Civil Code were very unfairly treated. This is the case both among the Romans and those who accepted the *Jus Civile* as the basis of their common law. This arose from the social position of women who occupied a helpless and dependent rank in society. What seems both strange and contrary to the spirit of the Code is that the more helpless they were, and consequently the more the aid of the law was required to maintain their rights, the less was this given by the State, and the greater room left for chance or individual caprice.

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE LAW OF TESTAMENT IN THE CORPUS.

The definition of Modestinus: *Testamentum est voluntatis nostræ justa sententia de eo quod quis post mortem suam fieri velit*,* has always been greatly admired for its neatness and accuracy. The general recognition of the right of Devise is made and its sanctions are enumerated. But the derivation of the word Testament given in the Institutes, L. II. Tit. 10, *initio*,† has been condemned by Aulus Gellius as faulty in etymology, and is now rejected. By the definition of Modestinus it follows that the devise is not to take effect until after the death of the testator. So this will can be changed as long as the testator remains in a condition to make a will at all. In the language of the *Isti*: *Voluntas voluntaria usque mortem est*, and can be revoked at pleasure. The propriety of this privilege is obvious, since new conditions may arise so long as we live to modify the amount of the devise itself, or the claims of the recipients.

A distinction was made between *Testamenta* and *Donationes mortis causa*. But this consisted in the time at which the change of possession occurred, and not in the nature of the cause which occasioned it. For from the nature of a will it cannot be executed until the death of the testator,‡ and would

* Dig. xxviii, Tit. 11. † Testamentum ex eo appellatur, quod testatio mentis est. ‡ Hebrews, Chap. ix. 16.

not have been made except in view of death at some future time, not necessarily imminent. Hence it is the testator's desire to retain the possession and use of his goods subject to future contingencies. But these *donationes*, which were given on the eve of a battle, or before going on a journey, or entering upon an undertaking attended with peculiar danger, were so bestowed because the donor wished the receiver to possess them in case the former died. But because the change of possession took place during the life of the deviser and so the transference could be made personally, no formalities were necessary, such as employed in making a Testament. For, in the former case, there could be no fraud or deception, because the owner must signify his wish to give the specified thing to the recipient and surrender his dominion over the property before possession could be assumed. This diversity of disposition gradually ceased, being superseded either by simple gift during the life of the owner, as in any other case of donation, or by making it a part of the testamentary devise. The latter method has become so easy through the facility of writing, by means of which the desire of the testator can be expressed in Codicils added up to the last moment of his rational action, coupled with the growing desire of disposing property while its application can be personally superintended, that *donationes mortis causa* belong to the past history of the law.

By the fifth of the XII Tab., there was the complete recognition of the Right of Devise: *UTI LEGASSET SUÆ REI, ITA JUS ESTO*. The right was absolute and unrestricted for those who were in a condition to make a will. For this is so explained by Pomponius, D. 50, T. 16: *Verbis legis duodecim Tabularum his, "uti legasset suæ rei ita jus esto," latissima potestas tributa videtur, et hæredis instituendi et legata et libertates dandi, tutelas quoque constituendi; sed id interpretatione coangustatum est vel legum vel auctoritate jura constituentium*. This simple principle was afterwards developed into a three-fold form of Testament, Inst. II, Tit. 10: *Quorum altero in pace et otio utebatur quod calatis comitiis appellabant, altero quum in prælium*

exituri essent, quod procinctum dicebatur. Accessit deinde tertium genus testamentorum quod dicebatur per æs et libram; scilicet quia per emancipationem, id est imaginariam quandam venditionem agebatur, et cetera. The two former methods early fell into disuse, so that the third only remained, and this not as it was at first. For the imaginary emancipation or sale was dispensed with by the prætorian edict, Inst. II, T. 10, § 2, *et seq.*, increasing the number of witnesses by two more to represent the balance holder and the purchaser. However, despite the numerous formalities demanded in making a will, as may be seen, Inst. II, T. 10, *passim*, yet in practice even these were found utterly inadequate to protect the right of Devise against the Heredipetæ; and this abuse became so great that, as we have seen, even the expediency of making a will was questioned. Legacy hunters could easily exercise undue influence upon the testator. For from the family relations, as then constituted, the husband and father was often a stranger to his wife and children. Hence there was ready access for flatterers and cunning rogues who could ingratiate themselves by a show of kind attentions to the testator in sickness or the feebleness of age; and, at the same time, poison his mind towards his nearest of kin. And when these methods did not suffice the rightful heirs were deprived of the estate through the forgery of wills, which became an acknowledged calling, just as much as the professional poisoner or blackmailer.* But while this abuse was admitted and deplored by satirists and statesmen, the right itself was not questioned. Only the perversion was held up to execration, just as all abuses which marked the decadence of morality.

The Military Testament, or *In Procinctu*, which was highly necessary among a martial people, from the nature of the case was attended with less formality than those regularly legalized, and therefore gave greater opportunity for fraud. For, in order to show favor to the soldier and meet the necessities of his position, nearly every formality was dispensed with in the camp, Inst. II, T. 11: *Quoque enim modo voluntatis ejus (scil*

* Pliny, Epist. II. 20.

militis) suprema inveniatur sive scripta sive sine scriptura, valet testamentum ex voluntate ejus. But the evil from forgery and undue influence exerted on the sick and aged had the effect of abridging the freedom of devise, and gave occasion for the *Leges Furia*,* *Voconia*,† and *Falcidia*.‡ For while the civil law still distinctly recognized the right of devise, yet the idea that this power should generally be limited to the disposal to natural heirs was both reasonable, and in accordance with traditional usage before the abuse of the *Heredipetæ* became rife.

Still, that the aim of the law was always to discover the true will of the testator, can be seen in the provisions which guard its exercise. "But, as certain persons are incapable of rational volition, which is the prime condition of devise, the making of a Testament is for them impossible. For if they have not the natural intelligence which is necessary to constitute a responsible person in law, it would be absurd for that law to be called upon to execute their wills." Vid. Inst. II, T. 12; Dig. 28, T. I, § 2, 17. Hence a person who is *non compos mentis*, either from natural imbecility or madness, is incapable of making a devise.§ But temporary madness incapacitates only for the time of its continuance, and hence if the will is made during a lucid period it is valid, though of course there is some uncertainty about such instruments, and they are open to litigation in order to determine the fact of sanity. It is clear that the subsequent recovery of the testator cannot render valid the instrument made when he was *non compos*.|| So also children, under a certain age, usually fixed by law at fourteen for males and twelve for females, could not devise, because, from their immaturity of judgment and liability to be influenced, they cannot be said to have a will of their own.

A married woman was excluded from exercising this right because she was strictly under the power of her husband. This was especially the case under the Roman law, where her legal subjection—*sub manum*—was complete; and also among the

* *Gainus*, I. 42-46. † *Cic. in Verr.* 2, 1, 42. ‡ *Inst. II, Tit. 22.* § *Inst. II. 12.* || *Inst. II. 12; Dig. 28, 1, 5, 6.*

modern nations of Europe the *femme couverte* is not considered to have the power of independent volition.* A captive in the hands of the enemy was deemed incompetent, for the obvious reason that he is not *possessor sui*, and therefore can be constrained to act as his master dictates. The reasons for all these provisions are self-evident, because they interfere with the power of independent action, without which there can be no definite expression of the devisor's will.† The regulation touching bodily sickness, as distinguished from mental weakness, shows the true intent of the law. For as no amount of physical infirmity hinders the exercise of testamentary power, provided the mind is rational, the purpose of the law is clearly seen in the almost universal formula: "Weak in body, but sound in mind." This grew into such extensive use that it was often employed by those who made their wills while in perfect health, and at length came to be considered a necessary introduction.

The general disfavor towards Nuncupative Wills, shown in every stage of the law's development, does not question the testator's right to devise in this way, but proves the conviction that a will thus made is liable to both fraudulent and accidental mistakes. Hence when writing became universal for all kinds of business, there was no adequate reason for risking this danger of fraud. When writing was the privilege of the few, provision must be made for such testaments.‡ For the law consults the good of those by whose authority it is enacted, and therefore can ask for no greater precision in making known the testator's intention than his culture and surroundings allow. At common law a Court of Chancery might possibly still sustain a Nuncupative will, provided there was clear corroborative proof of its intent and provisions. In Britain, by statute of I. Vic. 26, these are not valid; and the course of legal practice is now so strongly against them everywhere that they are seldom offered for probate.

The provisions so carefully guarded for the enactment and

* Inst. II, 12, 5; Dig. 28, 1, 8. † Dig. 28, T. 1, 2. ‡ Inst. II, 10, § 4.

interpretation of wills show that the primary purpose of the law is to discover the real intention of the testator, and when this is known, to enforce it by all the powers of the State.

The last part of this subject is the Limitation of the Right of Devise. Like every other right of man in society, while its nature as affecting the individual alone is absolute, yet when applied to him as a member of a political body, it necessarily becomes limited by his relations to others; yet in this, as in all other cases, that government which interferes least with the liberty of the subject that is consistent with the rights of all, undoubtedly performs its functions best. Hence interferences, when they do occur, should always be for the protection of the citizen in his natural rights against encroachments from others, and for his defence against his own mistakes or ignorance. The limitations of this particular right by law present themselves under two forms, viz.: Power of the testator to alienate from his family; and Enforcement of his will as to the use to be made of his bequest.

The Mosaic law, and that of all countries where primogeniture prevails, holds substantially that the power of bequest is limited to the transference within the family of the testator. Plato held the same view.* Feudal and aristocratic governments consider this necessary to their existence; for the power of the family must be maintained, and in order to do this the estate must remain intact in its possession. Commonwealths and republics, on the other hand, give greater freedom to the power of bequest. The feudal system, which moulded modern European society, rendered entail necessary, since if estates were not held together, their proprietors would not be able to defend themselves in that unsettled period which succeeded the dissolution of the Roman Empire. And after all occasion for the practice had ceased, the usage had become so thoroughly engrafted on the parent stock of the civil code that it has obstinately held its own against the reaction toward the Roman freedom of bequest. The limitations which the civil law fixed were made to prevent supposi-

* *De Legg.* XI.

titious wills and the tricks of the Hereditipæ. By the laws of the Twelve Tables (Table V), as we have seen, the right of devise was unlimited. Then the Lex Furia, A. U. C. 570, estimated the amount which could be alienated from the legal heir at 1000 æs; while the Lex Voconis, A. U. C. 584, prohibited more than half the estate from alienation. Finally, the Lex Falcidia was enacted in these words:* "*Lata est Lex Falcidia quod caveatur ne plus legare liceat quam dodrantem totorum bonorum, id est sive unus hæres institutus esset sive plures, apud eum eorum pars quarta remaneret.*" This law was further defined and supplemented by Justinian, who in the Eighteenth Novel gave an exhaustive interpretation of the principles involved. His preface contains the substance:† "*Ut legitima portio liberorum, si quatuor sunt liberi, quatuor unciae, si vero plures quam quatuor sunt liberi, sex unciae sint; et ut liberi naturales, sobole legitima non existente, ab intestato duas uncias cum matre accipiant, et ut tam ex testamento collatio compelat nisi testator expresse prohibeat,*" etc. These limitations were undoubtedly beneficial, because they met an evil then existing, and in their increasing particularity we can trace the history of the growing abuse they were intended to counteract; but the same limitations become hurtful when applied in a state of society where the evils they aimed at do not exist. The limitations by entail, for example, rendered necessary by Mosiac tribal division, the aristocracy of Sparta and the Platonic Republic, reappear again in the Feudal System as a necessary element of that form of polity. But for quiet times and free governments the limitation by entail cannot but be hurtful. For the retention of an estate in a fixed line of succession is fraught with numberless evils, a few only of which can be specified here.‡ The heir, being absolutely determined even before birth, in due time receives the property whether deserving or not; and by the certainty of possession is exempted from the wholesome fear of being disinherited for misconduct, as well as the natural incitements to energy and industry. The

* Inst. II., 22. † XVIII. Nov. Proem. ‡ See Edinburgh Rev., July, 1824, p. 356.

other children, or rightful heirs, are despoiled of their rights, to enrich a single one to a needless extent. A hereditary aristocracy is thus created, irresponsible to the State, because in the main superior to the law by which others are governed, and so out of sympathy with the great mass of the people. The House of Lords in England at the present time, and the hereditary nobility in France prior to the Revolution, are notable examples of an estate which is useless in itself, and, by the vicious lives of its members, a disgrace to morals and a dead weight to progress. The property itself, being tied up by irrevocable conditions made in ignorance of its subsequent capacities or requirements, is kept in an unproductive state; it is subjected to the disadvantages of being sometimes possessed by one who cannot properly manage it, but must needs keep it, whether profitable to him or not. So strongly have the evils of this singular system been felt in France that a radical change was made by the Revolution. In order to destroy the aristocracy, whose vices and excesses had done so much to bring about that great upheaval of society, the law of equal partition was made, and it was declared illegal to alienate the entire estate to the detriment of the natural heirs. So beneficial did these innovations prove that they were embodied in the Code Napoleon: * "*Les libéralités soit par actes entre vifs, soit par testament, ne pourront excéder la moitié des biens du disposant s'il laisse à son décès qu'un enfant légitime; le tiers s'il laisse deux enfants; le quart s'il laisse trois ou un plus grand nombre.*"

The injustice and impolicy of entail are felt so strongly in Britain that there has been a vociferous cry for redress. Even such conservative writers as Adam Smith,† and McCulloch,‡ who approve of the right of primogeniture, still cannot but feel that entail is a most serious drawback to social progress. More radical publicists, like Bentham, Mill,§ and Gladstone, have labored for the suppression of the rights of entail and primogeniture altogether. While descent is manifestly the natural

* C. N., 915. † Pol. Econ., p. 170. ‡ Pol. Econ., Notes, p. 559. § Pol. Econ., B. 5, chap. 9, § 4.

course for property to take, still the interference of the law to compel the possessions of intestates or impuberes to follow this course is both unjust and injurious. For it often occurs that the parents are needy and helpless, and in such a case any child possessing natural affection would be quite as desirous to provide for their wants as parents are for their children. Hence the interference of the law in obstructing this dictate of reason and affection is manifestly unjust. The Praetors sometimes* relieved such cases by special acts, but this sort of relief being precarious, something more certain in its application is necessary. Modern jurisprudence has a tendency to correct the evil, so that, with the general freedom of bequest which advancing morality inculcates, the hardship of leaving a parent unprovided for is mostly confined to cases of intestacy. The law of nature, as well as filial affection, points to the duty of supporting during the feebleness of second childhood those who have cared for us in infancy. This being a dictate of universal morality, it must sweep away all enactments of statute law which interfere with the desire to care for parents when they need our help.

The equality of the sexes before the law, which universal progress is making more and more clear, tends to remove the last barrier to the complete exercise of the right of devise. And here it is clear that the dependence of the female, so far from being a reason that she should not inherit equally with the other sex, points to the necessity of her receiving a larger portion. So the interference of the law in preventing a woman from inheriting equally because she holds a subordinate position, is founded upon wrong ideas about the constitution of society.

One of the most perplexing questions, and one which has given rise to litigation in which the will of the testator is most frequently disregarded, is the right to make a bequest to a corporation coupled with conditions as to its application. That one man has a right to make a gift to another coupled with con-

* Sir Wm. Jones, *Com. in Tacrum.*

ditions which, if not complied with, make the donation void, will not be questioned. These conditions may be of any sort whatever not involving contradiction or absurdity, and their lawfulness is recognized, provided the recipient takes the gift subject to the restrictions. The donee can, of course, refuse the gift, and cannot be compelled to accept it. But if he does, knowing all the conditions, he is morally as well as legally bound to comply with the provisions subject to which the gift was received. The same rights appertain to legacies left by testament as to gifts *inter vivos*, with the addition that there is a peculiar sanctity attached to the last request of one who is no longer among men. While the giver was alive he had the power to enforce the application according to the terms by which it was made a donation. When dead, then the law steps in to enforce his trust; and if it was right for him to demand the fulfillment of his will at one time, the government, which is his creature and for that reason his servant, so far as he acts according to its provisions, is bound to enforce his expressed desire at every subsequent period. For if the conditions are not complied with, then the donation is, *per se*, revoked; and it is only an act of violence and robbery, both to the donor and to the law under which it was bestowed, so long as the lawless possession is continued.

In the case of property left to persons, it is understood that each successive owner will have, not merely usufruct, but dominion; and hence the right to dispose of the thing itself subject only to such new conditions as arise out of the changed relations of successors. For this reason it is not usual, except in the case of entail, the nature of which has been noticed, to bind the successors beyond the life of the next following inheritor. Conditions extending further than this are viewed by the law with disfavor, because they interfere with the full right of devise, which, in order to be complete, must carry with it dominion, and this reside in each successive generation of owners. But in the case of eleemosynary or religious corporations an entirely different principle obtains. For here is a

corporate body, with a strictly defined character set forth by a written constitution and by-laws, but which cannot as an individual possess any voluntary powers of devise. Hence any gift made to such a body is conveyed under the expressed conditions that it shall be used for the purposes which are set forth by the recipient, and for no other objects or uses whatever. By probate of the will containing these provisions the law makes a contract, in which it binds itself to enforce the will of the testator. Unless there are powers of alienation or changes of object allowed in the terms of the devise, the contract between the donor and the body accepting the gift is a matter of strict literal interpretation. The law is often called to interfere for maintaining the validity of a will making a gift to corporations, and is usually jealous in supporting the rights of the heirs by blood against them. But if the testator's soundness of mind and mature purpose of gift are proven, the devise should certainly be enforced in its terms, inasmuch as there is a contract made by the law. This principle is covered by the decision of the Supreme Court in the celebrated Dartmouth College case, and may be considered as established theoretically in the policy of this country. The only exception which should be allowed is where there is a manifest and unfounded disregard of the claims of the family, and this should prevent the will from being admitted to probate. But the claim of the corporation rests upon its application, in good faith, of the legacy to the purposes for which the testator intended his bequest. It is clear that no action could be maintained by a corporation which changed its objects between the time of the devise and the execution of the testaments. So, from this well-established principle it follows that there is a contract, on the part of the corporation also, to apply the trust to the purposes expressed by the donor in his deed of gift; and when this contract is violated by the recipient the legacy lapses thereby and reverts to the possession of the legitimate heirs of the deceased. There need be no difficulty in a case where but little time has elapsed, but length of undisturbed possession is understood to give pre-

scriptive right of dominion. Yet possession for uses specified in the devise do not give prescriptive right for uses *contrary* to the terms and intent of the devise; so that really no lapse of time between the date of the gift and the perversion of its object is a reason to debar the heir-at-law from recovery. The possession for uses contrary to the stipulations is simply robbery and retention of stolen goods; and hence ouster of the wrongful occupant becomes the highest duty of the law.

Legacies bestowed upon hospitals and asylums intended for the relief of physical suffering present no difficulties. The conditions remain the same, and therefore the application of the charity cannot be mistaken. But in the case of foundations for religious orders, for colleges and universities, where specific doctrines are to be taught, great difficulties arise from the change of religious views in successive generations of recipients. It has been held by Mill,* that no condition requiring certain doctrines to be taught for an indefinite time should be valid in law, because no one can tell what will be held as the orthodox view many ages hence. If the law would refuse to probate a will with such conditions, then it would act consistently; but when it accepts the instrument, and thereby promises to execute its provisions, a positive contract is made which cannot be annulled according to the principle involved in the Dartmouth case. And while we hold that it is a gross mistake to assert that no one can anticipate what religious views will be proper to be taught, since truth is unchangeable and the will of God is as abiding as His own nature, still the question at issue is different from what Mill and similar theorists hold. For the true contention is not whether such and such doctrines should be taught, but whether a man has a right to give, and a corporation to receive, money for teaching them. If he has not the right to give for this purpose the corporation has not the right to receive, and the question is settled at once. The law is the transgressor in permitting the testament to be ratified. It is false to its trust as the guardian of society in failing to protect

* Pol. Econ., B. II., Chap. II., § 4.

its interests. For the law must not profess to enforce the will of a man unless it was right and proper for him to make it. But surely, after he has died and is no longer present to redress his own wrongs, the law cannot relieve itself of responsibility by pleading the illegality of a bequest which it once admitted to be lawful. The law, as observed before, can refuse to accept a will made with such provisions, and, perhaps, by so doing would not exceed its delegated powers. But it is too late, after having once undertaken to maintain the will, to say that this must not be enforced because another generation entertains views different from those of the testator. As well say that because at one time agrarian laws, or a community of goods is advocated by the dominant party in a state, therefore the rich must be despoiled of the fruits of their industry to feed the idle and vicious. It would be no greater injustice to force living men to give money to support a view of religion deemed by themselves radically heretical, than it is to wrest the property of a deceased person, who consecrated it for teaching that view of religion which he believed to be true, and apply it to support that system which he considered false. The propriety of making a devise with conditions applying to a state of facts which cannot be foreseen may well be entertained on the part of the testator. It is doubtless best not to hamper a legacy with many and intricate conditions. But this is saying no more than what is applicable to any gift or alienation *inter vivos*. Yet this is wholly different from deciding what religious truths must be taught in order to determine the validity of a will. Besides, religious truths do not change, though those placed to teach them at a particular place do and pervert the doctrines they were appointed to maintain. Church polity may change, the established order of worship may be modified, yet this does not affect the cardinal doctrines of Revealed Religion. Hence, an honest enforcement of a clearly expressed will bestowing a legacy for teaching these doctrines is easy, when the courts look to law and justice. The trouble is not to know what was in the testator's mind to do, nor the doctrines which he intended

to be taught, but an unwillingness to resist the clamors of a changed public opinion. Questions of interpretation of the testator's meaning, or the belief held by the corporation, may arise and require settlement by a Court of Equity; but this is no more than occurs in any other application of abstract justice to the complicated affairs of life. There are other cases which arise, when the state makes conquests of territory in which a sacred trust is held by a government where different religious views prevail. Then the rights of such foundations must be on a par with the rights of private property, to be determined by the will of the conqueror. So, also, when there is a general reformation in doctrine and practice, as that of Luther in Germany, and the Reformers in England. Then the condition of church and university foundations must depend upon the changed relations of state which control them if they are governmental institutions; but if they are under sectarian control, then the law of the land should still enforce their application to the uses expressed in the devise. For charitable and educational bequests should be encouraged by every legitimate means, since they stimulate the highest of human motives to industry and energy in business; and by the uses of wealth thus gained elevate the standard of culture and morals among a people. And nothing can be a greater incentive to testamentary bequests to corporations than the absolute certainty that the law will enforce their application to the objects intended by the donors. But who will exert himself to acquire means beyond the uses which personal comfort, or the requirements of his family demand, if he has no assurance that his earnings will be applied according to his best judgment after they have left his care, whether that be during his life, or afterward? Herein the law appears as the creature of the social compact to enforce the rights which are natural to man and necessarily developed by his relations to society; rights as indispensable to his spiritual being as air and food to his living body.

Hence the chief end of government is attained just in proportion as it interferes not to obstruct, but to enforce, the will of

the people; of which, as the expression of the true relation of man to his Creator, it may be truly said: *Vox populi, vox Dei.*

There is a strong demand for greater certainty that the law will enforce the plain intent of testamentary bequest. There is nothing more discouraging in the present administration of justice than the facility with which the plainest intent of the testator is perverted. We have a notable example of this in the case of Mr. Tilden, who determined to bestow a princely benefaction for the good of that city where he had amassed his fortune. With a knowledge of law and a sagacity scarcely equalled, he drew a will in which, after devising liberally for all who had claims upon him, he provided for a great public library which should be a blessing to the community, and a memorial of himself for all time. His intention was evident. His desire most praiseworthy. The terms of his will as exact as human ingenuity could make them. But the courts, instead of being the guardian of a most solemn trust for the good of mankind, rob the dead by a quibble equally dishonorable to their honesty or their intelligence. The intended charity is perverted from the will of the donor, and bestowed where it is not needed; and where, from the manifested character of the recipients, it will do no good. Such miscarriages of justice prevent the exercise of charity by those who have the means, while discouraging such traits of character as render charity possible. It is natural that any man who has shown himself capable of amassing a fortune should desire to hold it while he is in active life, because he is justified in believing he can manage it better than any one else. Hence he retains it in his own possession in the reasonable hope that he will still make it greater and capable of wider good. But the uncertainty of the law in the enforcement of an undisputed right of free devise, has grown to be an evil almost equal to the forging of wills during the Roman decadence. It calls loudly for a reformation in our code of practice; so that a will fairly drawn by a man who has shown himself capable of gaining and managing the estate which he devises, shall be as certain as the warrantee deed which the state gives

to the purchaser of land from its domain. But if the bulk of the estate is to be eaten up by rapacious lawyers, and the pittance that remains after every exorbitant charge of litigation, needlessly prolonged, is to be perverted from the testator's evident intention, there is little incentive left for that self-denying virtue which is the foundation of all wealth, and the means of all charity.

From the subject, as here considered, it is contended :

I. That Testamentary Devise is both a Natural Right and inseparable from our relations in Civil Society.

II. That it is inherent in the Right of Dominion, and a necessary element of Individual Property.

III. That while absolute in itself, like all other Natural Rights, it is limited in its application by the relations of Society.

IV. That the Limitations of the Right by Civil and Statute Laws should be multiplied no farther than those for the protection of the individual which are suggested by the combined wisdom of his fellow-men.

V. That the History of this subject points to an unvarying recognition of the Right of Testamentary bequest increasing in clearness in exact ratio to the progress of intelligence and virtue.

VI. That the strict enforcement of this Right is one of the most efficient stimuli to virtuous activity.

VII. That laxity in the enforcement of the fair intention of the testator is, at the present time, a marked evil of our legal practice, and most discouraging to those who are able and desire to foster our Public Charities.

III.

THE SPIRIT OF THE ORIENT.

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.

IN an address delivered some years ago before the Liverpool Institute the Hon. George J. Goschen, a member of the British Cabinet, ventured the remarkable assertion, that it was lack of imagination that cost Great Britain her North American colonies. "Statesmen," he says, "were not able to sympathize with, or to throw themselves into the position of these colonies; they could not represent to themselves absent things; and supposed that England, with what they had learned there, must be sufficient for their guidance in the discharge of their imperial duties." That there is much truth in this remarkable confession can hardly be doubted. It is a precious thing to be able to sympathize with other times and conditions; to understand the men and women of other countries; to enjoy in the midst of our monotonous lives the intense pleasure of mental change of scene. We are in constant danger—indeed, it is said to be the chief danger of our age and nation—of growing narrow-minded; of supposing that because our way is a good way it must be the only true way; of feeling and expressing contempt for those whose thoughts and sentiments are different from our own, and thus becoming vain, self-satisfied, modern Philistines. To elevate us above these depressing conditions, we conceive to be the main purpose of the study of history. Surely, it must be a glorious thing to rise above our narrow surroundings; to fill out our necessarily stunted careers; to open up vistas of other worlds; to glorify our lives.

That such study is of practical value goes without saying.

If Lord North and his cabinet had been able for the moment to put themselves in the place of the American colonists, they might, as Mr. Goschen intimates, have known how to avoid the difficulties which led to the disruption of the British empire.

We may, perhaps, advance a step further and assert our conviction that the more distant the scene to which the imagination transports us, the more intense becomes the delight—the more excellent the mental development which the journey conveys. If we had the magic tapestry of Prince Houassin to bear us whither we would, should we not, therefore, take our flight to the distant Orient, the land which is as different as possible from our own, where fancy runs riot, and the wildest dreams of poesy become actual realities. To many of us, indeed, these visions of the Orient are as vague and misleading as the mirage of Sahara. Possibly they consist of half-unconscious reminiscences of those wonderful stories, *The Arabian Nights*, which provide for childhood so many of its most intense delights. Have we not been companions of the recent Laureate in his wonderful voyage:

“ When the breeze of a joyful dawn blew free
In the silken sail of infancy,
The tide of time flowed back with me—
The forward flowing tide of time;
And many a sheeny summer morn,
Adown the Tigris I was borne,
By Bagdad's shrines of fretted gold,
High-walled gardens green and old;
True Musselman was I and sworn,
For it was in the golden prime
Of good Haroun Alraschid.”

Is it possible to commune with the spirit of the Orient? Can the great genius who spreads his gigantic form over sea and land be induced to re-enter the vessel that is stamped with the seal of Solomon? How far, indeed, does the Orient extend? The question may be differently answered. Religious writers have often limited the term to Palestine, the land which must forever remain to Christian faith the Orient, made glorious

by the rising of the Sun of Righteousness. Literature until recently recognized it as synonymous with the land of the Mohammedans; but since "far Cathay" and "the land of the rising sun" have been opened to our vision, the conception has been vastly extended. Perhaps, for our present purpose, it may be well to follow the Greek geographers in dividing the old world into two parts only—Europe and the East; for if the essayist is not at liberty to select a theme which can be elaborated with some degree of minuteness, it is perhaps best to choose a subject of such exceeding vastness that special investigation cannot possibly be expected.

If we limit our studies to a portion, however small, of these great eastern lands, there will be much to describe; but in the regions that stretch far away from the Hellespont to the Yellow sea, there are many nations, many languages, many religions, and the peculiarities which they have in common are so few in number that our task is actually diminished by the extent of its theme.

That the Orient has a spirit of its own, as distinguished from the Occident, has never been called into question. Its influence is felt even in eastern Europe, but grows more perceptible as we journey through Asia, until it becomes all-pervading in the remotest East. It is subtle, intangible, incomprehensible; but its manifestations are everywhere apparent. They are so peculiar and distinctive that we may regard them as characteristic of the spirit itself.

Travelers agree that the earliest impressions of the visitor to the Orient is one of curious unreality. To observe how the world appears tranversed is almost comical. If men in Oriental lands do not actually stand on their heads, as students of primary geography are apt to suppose, their views are at least so contrary to our own that we should not be surprised to find them assuming some such unusual position. Every domestic art, every social custom, is practiced in a manner directly opposite to that with which we are familiar. That the people speak backwards, write backwards, read backwards, is

but the beginning of their contrary ways. We know and expect these things, of course; but when we come into actual contact with them, we grow indignant, and are ready to protest against such flagrant violations of established order. Even those of us who have studied Semitic languages can rarely get entirely beyond the feeling that the direction of Oriental writing is unnatural, and can sympathize with the bookseller who catalogued a Hebrew Bible as "a book whose end is the beginning."

It seems a paradox to say that almost simultaneously with the impression that everything is topsy-turvy, the traveler in the Orient is made to feel that all things are immutable. For thousands of years there seems to have been no important change. There are cities there which are older than written history, and temples that were ancient when western Europe was still inhabited by painted savages. "The people are even less changed than the countries they inhabit. The fertile vale of Siddim has been replaced by the Dead Sea, and the delta of the Nile has pressed forward into the bosom of the Mediterranean; but the patriarch still sits at the door of his tent on the Plain of Mamre, and the Egyptian cultivates his river-given soil in the manner practiced by the subjects of the Pharaohs. While we look upon the very scenes where Paradise was Lost and Regained—where the Pyramids and Karnac rose and still vindicate their early fame—we find *that* scenery still peopled by the Ishmaelite, and the stranger still received by sheikhs of Abraham's fashion, who feast him on the fare that was set before the angels." *

It is not until the stranger has become to some extent acquainted with the people of the East that he discovers that the ground of all this is to be looked for in a certain condition of the Oriental mind. There is everywhere a conspicuous lack of individuality. Man, from a western point of view, has not attained to clear self-consciousness. Unless he has been lifted by external conditions above the level of the multitude he has no ambition. He is rather inclined, like the cobbler in the

* Warburton's *Cross and Crescent*.

Arabian tale, to thank God that he is not grand vizier. "For, as long as I keep pegging away at shoes, the Sultan will not cut off my head, bismillah!"

Here we have one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the East. A recent writer says: "If we take, through the earth's north temperate zone, a belt of country whose northern and southern edges are determined by certain limiting isotherms, not more than half the width of the zone apart, we shall find that we have included in a relatively small extent of surface almost all the nations of note in the world, past or present. Now if we examine this belt, and compare the different parts of it with one another, we shall be struck by a remarkable fact. *The peoples inhabiting it grow steadily more personal as we go west.* So unmistakable is this gradation that one is almost tempted to ascribe it to cosmical rather than to human causes. It is as marked as the change in color of the human complexion along any meridian, which ranges from black at the equator to blonde toward the pole. In like manner the sense of self grows more intense as we follow in the wake of the setting sun, and fades steadily as we advance into the dawn. America, Europe, the Levant, India, Japan, each is less personal than the one before. We stand at the nearer end of the scale, the Far Orientals at the other. If with us the I seems to be of the very essence of the soul, then the soul of the far East may be said to be Impersonality.*"

This mental condition is everywhere apparent, less decidedly than elsewhere in Persia, where the Aryan element is strongest; but even in the literature of Iran, as it has been rendered for us by Baron von Hammer-Purgstall, the same spirit appears. Thus the dervish poet, Nimpetolah, of Kuhistan, declared his conviction as follows:

"Ask me not, as muftis can,
To recite the Alcoran;
Well I know the meaning sweet—
The book I tread beneath my feet.

* Lowell's *Soul of the Far East*, p. 14.

Lo! the God's love blazes higher,
Till all difference expire,
What are Moslems? what are Gisors,
All are one, and all is ours."

And again, of all places, we find it in Hilali's ode to a flute:

"Hear what, now loud, now low, the pining flute complains,
Without tongue, yellow-cheeked, full of winds that wail and sigh,
Saying, sweetheart, the old mystery remains,
If I am I, thou thou, or thou art I."

Poor fellow! He was not certain whether he was she, or she he, or whether, in fact, "it was neither of them."

The Oriental muses rather than thinks; and as he cannot solve the problems of existence, he reaches at best the consciousness of an all-pervading mystery. He has a profound sympathy with nature and delights in portraying its varied forms. With great leisure and few books he is exquisitely sensible to the pleasures of poetry. Layard gives the following incident as an illustration of the effect of *extempore* poetry on the children of the desert, which might as well have occurred in other regions of the Orient:

"When the bard improvised an amatory ditty," he says, "the young chief's excitement was almost beyond control. The other Bedouins were scarcely less moved by these rude measures, which have the same kind of effect on the wild tribes of the Persian mountains. Such verses, chanted by their self-taught poets, or by the girls of their encampment, will drive warriors to the combat, fearless of death, or prove an ample reward, on their return from the dangers of the *ghazon*, or the fight. The excitement they produce exceeds that of the grape. He who would understand the influence of the Homeric ballads in the heroic ages should witness the effect which similar compositions have upon the wild nomads of the East." Elsewhere he adds, "Poetry and flowers are the wine and spirits of the Arab; a couplet is equal to a bottle, and a rose to a dram, without the evil effect of either."

Life in the East is short, and often fierce and hazardous in

its extremes. "Its elements are few and simple, not exhibiting the long range of occidental existence, but rapidly reaching the best and the worst." The rich feeds on fruit and game—the poor on carobs, or something worse. But what does it matter whether your life is long or short, whether you are rich or poor—a sultan or a calendar? In India it is *karma*, in Arabia it is *kismet*.

The Oriental is brave, because life has little value. He endures pain with patience, but seems hardly conscious of intense torture. It has been said that the Oriental is sure "to kiss the hand that smites him, if only it smites hard enough." He has no conception of personal or civil liberty, but is easily moved to enthusiasm by ideas which to us appear remote from daily life. Think of the Christian boys of Alexandria fighting pitched battles, as Dean Stanley tells us, on such a question as whether Christ's will is only divine or human also. Ordinarily hard to move, an epigram, a ringing battle-cry, may in the Orient rouse a multitude to intense excitement, and its power, when directed by a master mind, is almost irresistible. The elements of social life are few in number. "The prolific sun and the sudden and rank plenty which his heat engenders, make subsistence easy. On the other hand, the desert, the aimoom, the mirage, the lion and the plague endanger it, and life often hangs on the contingency of a skin of water, more or less." Even the geography of the Orient exhibits these contrasts. "My father's empire," said Cyrus to Xenophon, "is so large that people perish with cold at one extremity whilst they are suffocated with heat at the other." The temperament of the people agrees with these extremes, and, as might be expected, Oriental characteristics are practically innumerable. In the Arabian tale, the life of the heroine depends on her success in picking up all the seeds of a pomegranate which lie scattered on the ground, and the one which she fails to find is suddenly transformed into some terrible *chimera*. To guard against a similar result may we say that our present purpose is not completeness, but having indicated the existence of a Spirit

of the Orient, by enumerating a few of its characteristics, to proceed to the contemplation of its constituent elements.

Leaving subsidiary causes for the present out of the question, we may venture to declare, with Warburton, that "the chief source of Oriental culture is religion." It will, therefore, be found, on closer investigation, that the great religions of the East contain elements which naturally develop into the peculiarities which we have attempted to portray. It is a curious fact that not one of these religions has remained entirely, or even in great part, the possession of the race that produced it. Brahminism and Buddhism are of Aryan origin; but they have passed beyond their original seats and are now in great part the religions of the Turanian races. Christianity, on the other hand, is one of the Semitic religions; but it has in great degree lost its hold upon the lands which gave it birth, and the majority of its professors are of the Aryan race. Its course has been towards the West, where its lessons of individuality and of the value of the human soul are more readily appreciated. The oracles which were at first committed to Israel, have by its means become a source of unnumbered blessings to all the regions that stretch towards the setting sun. Between the remote East and the active, bustling West, we find, not unexpectedly, a religion whose adherents seem to be only half awake; a religion which is not original, but whose name—Islam, or rest in God—indicates the feature which is most attractive to the Oriental mind.

The great religions of the East present innumerable illustrations of our theme. Brahmanism has been called the most ancient of human religions, but it is doubtful if in any proper sense it deserves to be called a religion. The Pantheistic doctrine which forms its foundation recognizes a contrast between rest and motion, but not between good and evil. In the *Rigveda* there is a certain acknowledgment of a supreme being—the brahm or breathing-soul—but even there we find the beginning of a compromise with popular sentiment which regarded the grand and striking phenomena of nature in the light

of personal conscious beings. Nowhere, except perhaps in ancient Egypt, is the contrast between *esoteric* and *exoteric* doctrine more plainly apparent. The *deva*, or shining ones, may at first have been symbols only, but their worship soon degenerated into rank idolatry. There may be something fascinating in the Hindoo triad—Brahma, the Creator; Vishnu, the preserver; and Siva, the destroyer—but when we find it multiplied into the thirty thousand deities of the modern Hindoo pantheon, with their varying and often conflicting cults, the subject loses its interest and pity takes the places of sympathy.

Orthodox Brahmanism, as well as Buddhism, regards all existence as pain, and looks forward to deliverance by absorption into the divine essence. Man is a bubble on the ocean—the bubble bursts, but a similar one is at hand to take its place. Those whose minds are entirely abstracted from worldly things and have by reflection gained a knowledge of the divine nature become absorbed into the universal soul immediately on the dissolution of the body. Others must pass through changes and transformations innumerable before their final reunion with the supreme. As Emerson expresses it:

" If the red slayer thinks he slays,
Or if the slain think he's slain,
They know not well the subtle ways,
I turn, and turn, and turn again."

A missionary in India was crossing the Ganges in the same boat with a Brahmin. "Brahmin," he inquired, "do you believe that your soul is a part of God?" "Most certainly," was the reply. "And yet," continued the inquirer, "God rules the universe. Does your soul take part in that celestial government?" Without answering in words, the Brahmin took half the shell of a cocoanut that was lying in the boat, and filled it with water from the river. "Is this water a part of the Ganges?" he inquired. "Yes," replied the missionary, for he did not deem it best to be too critical. "And yet on the Ganges great ships are floating. Can a ship float on this little cup?" "No." Then, suiting the action to the word, the Brahmin spilled the

water from the shell into the river and triumphantly inquired: "Is not the water which I held in my hand now doing its part in floating the ships? Even so my soul, when it returns to its source, shall bear its part in the government of the universe." No wonder that the missionary, in his appeal to the American churches, pleads with them to send learned men as missionaries to India, and to leave their ignorant devotees at home!

When Gautama Buddha, otherwise known as Siddhartha and Sakyamuni, undertook the task of reforming Brahmanism, it seems never to have occurred to him to change its fundamental principles. His pessimism was even more pronounced than that of his predecessors. "If life is an evil, and death itself is no deliverance from life, it is necessary to go further back to discover the very origin, the seed, so to speak, of existence. This seed the Buddhist finds in 'Karma,' the sum of merit and demerit, which, as each one's demerit is the greater of the two, often comes to much the same thing as sin or error." "Root out 'Karma,' with its mistaken clinging to life, and there will be deliverance at last—deliverance from all sorrow and all trouble in the eternal rest of Nirvana." (*Encyc. Britt.*)

To destroy "Karma," and thus to attain to Nirvanā, Gautama opened the "four-fold path." The religion which he founded is extremely fascinating to the Oriental mind. "Self-conquest and universal charity are its fundamental themes, the melodies on whose variations its entrancing harmony is built up." Its effect on the Oriental races has been decidedly humanizing. In its moral teachings and religious ceremonial it so closely resembles Christianity that the early Jesuit missionaries termed it "Satan's caricature of the truth."

The character of Gautama is beautiful beyond description. A prince who from motives of the purest charity renounces his throne, bids farewell forever to a wife and child whom he loves beyond the power of expression, and literally becomes a beggar, in order that by his own sufferings he may lead others to eternal peace—such a personage in a certain sense deserves the tribute of admiration which unnumbered millions have poured at his

feet. To follow him in his quest for Nirvana, as its successive stages are depicted in "The Light of Asia," is not only a delightful literary employment, but may actually become an act of genuine devotion. And yet the religion which Gautama taught ignores the existence of God—replacing Him with a chain of endless causation—and practically denies the immortality of the soul, for "Karma" is not the soul, but rather the sum of deeds which gives rise to a new existence. Such a system leads to self-effacement—to the destruction of individuality. It can have no genuine history; it leaves no room for personal development. To compare it with Christianity betrays ignorance of the nature of true religion. The one degrades humanity; the other is its glorification. The one humiliates a prince to the condition of a beggar and leaves him there; the other elevates "the Man who had not where to lay His head" to a throne which is above all heavens, to be worshiped as the incarnate God.

The visitor to Bombay, or to some obscure towns of Persia, may catch an occasional glimpse of another Oriental religion, whose peculiarities may be held to contradict what has been said, but is in fact the exception which proves the rule. Certainly the Parsees manifest no lack of individuality. They are ideal merchants, and their wealth has become proverbial. Benevolence is said to be the most important tenet of their religion, and they have thirty-two charitable institutions in the city of Bombay alone. How highly they are esteemed by their English rulers is indicated by the fact that the only Orientals to whom the Queen of Great Britain has granted titles of nobility have been eminent Parsee merchants.

The individuality and energy of this remarkable people we attribute in great degree to their comparative freedom from the prevailing pantheism of the East. The sources of their religion, we remember, were very near to those from which Judaism and Christianity are derived. Their great teacher, Zoroaster (or Zarathustra), taught pure theism, and his follower, Cyrus, king of Persia, assisted in the building of the second temple at Jerusalem, and is called in the Bible "the beloved of the Lord."

Unfortunately, at a very early period the pure faith which appears in the Zend Avesta became obscured. To the magi of Media is believed to be due the introduction of the peculiar dualism, which divides its reverence between Ormuzd and Ahri-man, or light and darkness. Thus the way was opened for that symbolical worship of the elements, and particularly of fire, which has given its adherents the contemptuous name of "fire-worshippers." Degraded by its corruption, the religion of ancient Persia is now confined to a few thousand adherents; but such as it is, it is infinitely better, in all that concerns the development of true humanity, than the mighty systems of Brahmanism and Buddhism, with their millions of abject slaves.

Mohammedanism, as we have said, is not an original religion, but for this very reason it includes elements which attract our interest and sympathy. Its decided monotheism and extreme legalism are essentially Jewish. The recognition of the prophetic character of Jesus, and possibly the intense hatred of images which is characteristic of all the Mohammedan races, may have been derived from the heretical Christians who had just been worsted in the great iconoclastic controversy. The sensual element, including polygamy and materialistic views of heaven and hell, are undoubtedly heathen; but what is the origin of the element which gives its name to the system? Is Islam—that "rest in God" which renders the Moslem insensible to the dangers of the battle-field because he knows he cannot die until his time has come—derived from the West or from the East? Is it akin to Christian predestination or to Oriental fatalism? Has it come from St. Augustine or from Sakyamuni?

Let it be remembered that when Mohammed appeared, the religion of the Arabians, such as it was, was thoroughly Oriental. While they recognized a supreme God, whom they called Allah, each tribe worshiped gods of its own who were sometimes called "the children of Allah." It was not believed that man could communicate with Allah or that he heard prayer. Then "the camel-driver of Mecca" appeared upon the scene, with his simple message: "There is no God but God,"

to which he subsequently added the phrase, "and Mohammed is the prophet of God."

In the whole history of the Orient there is nothing more fascinating than the career of Mohammed and his coadjutors. Consider him as we like—as the prophet, priest, or king of Arabia—and his personality is wonderful. Nor can we refuse our admiration to Ali, "the lion of God," and to Omar, the wild son of the desert, who, at the time when the prophet himself lay hidden for fear of the Koreish, boldly entered the Kaaba and made its arches ring with his triumphant cry: "La Ila Illulah! Wa Mohammed Rasoul Ullah!" When the Koreish sought to induce Mohammed to desist from his work by offering him gifts, he burst forth in the splendid utterance: "Though they gave me the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, yet will I not pause till the Lord bring my cause unto victory;" and yet these same Koreish subsequently accomplished their purpose without a bribe. When the seven-years' war was ended, and all Arabia lay prostrate at the prophet's feet, family affection grew strong upon him. Having conquered the Koreish in battle he sought to make them amends and to gain their affection by doing them honor. They remained the hereditary priests of Mecca, and while they claimed to exceed all others in their devotion to the prophet, the ancient ceremonial was not greatly changed. The heathen *renaissance* had fairly begun. Miracles were invented and traditions fostered until the new structure was covered with foliage of the imagination like that which had adorned the old. Islam was systematized and explained in a spirit akin to that of the far East, and its effect was rather to repress individuality than to promote its highest development. Ali alone had courage to resist this backward movement; but the strength of the Koreish, conjoined with the hatred of Ayesha, the favorite wife of the prophet, was too great for him, so that he was driven into schism, and died at last the death of a martyr. His tragical fate and that of his sons, Hassan and Hosain, is the theme of the passion plays of Persia which are said to be mir-

acles of the dramatic art, and are certainly well worthy of closer examination.

To trace the history of Islam is beyond our purpose. That it reveals splendid subjects of study need hardly be said. There have been great warriors innumerable, but we prefer to remember such rulers as Almansor, the patron of learning, and Saladin, "the mirror of knightly courtesy." The Saracens, we know, were the teachers of Europe, whose scholars for ages sat humbly at the feet of Averroes and Avicenna. At Bagdad and Damascus science flourished, and scores of inventions are due to Oriental genius.

The Koran is even now the religious and civil law of more than one hundred millions of people. The system of jurisprudence, which is based upon that wonderful book, deserves more attention than it has hitherto received at our hands, especially as regards its relations to the social order — often called "Oriental Feudalism" — which may be regarded as one of the subsidiary causes of that lack of individuality to which we have so frequently referred.

The commandment of the prophet — founded no doubt on an erroneous interpretation of the second commandment — absolutely forbids the delineation of the human form; but it may be questioned whether, even without the prohibition, the East could have produced beautiful statues and great historical paintings. It would not have been in accordance with the spirit of the Orient. It must, however, be confessed that its wonderful sympathy with nature, especially in its vegetable forms, has led in other lines to the production of unequalled ideals of loveliness.

The Spirit of the Orient remains unchanged, except in the regions where European influence has recently been predominant. It has been suggested that in the East "every man might be his own great-grandfather." Western Asia has for ages lain prostrate at the feet of "the unspeakable Turk," and so long as his rule continues genuine progress is impossible. Yet the tendency of mind everywhere is to individualization, and

the eternal peace of Nirvana and the stately rest of Islam are alike losing their fascination. The religious systems of the East are lifeless, and the people follow their prescriptions with languid interest. Hence we find that in the regions touched by western influence, the few religious messengers whom we in our parsimony and lack of faith have sent them, have already accomplished wonderful revolutions. Politicians may sneer, if they will; but it is in this apparently insignificant movement alone that we must seek the key to the Oriental question. The Spirit of the Orient must be exorcised or the people will perish. They must be roused from their lethargy, or they will be swept from the earth. Already the nations of the West have drawn a cordon around them, and there are no indications that it will speedily be relaxed. One thing alone appears certain: That if the Oriental is to be saved, it must be by the power of the Truth that teaches the priceless value of each immortal soul; and which, therefore, cannot fail to raise him to a renewed and vigorous manhood.

IV.

PRESBYTERIANISM AND EDUCATION.*

BY REV. DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D.

CHRISTIANITY is the sworn friend of education. Its aim is to develop the whole man. All his faculties being of divine origin, are noble and deserve to be trained unto perfection. It is the soul's prerogative to attain to the knowledge of God through the works of creation and of grace. Life eternal is this: to *know* God and Jesus Christ, whom He hath sent. By the culture and science of his intellect, as well as by the holiness of his heart, man strives after likeness with the Creator.

The Church came only gradually to an adequate conception of the duty devolving upon a Christian community to provide means for universal education. Early in its history the close alliance of religion and higher learning was not only illustrated in St. Paul and Apollos, but demonstrated in the schools of Alexandria, Antioch, and other centres. Throughout the Dark and Middle Ages the monastery was the conservator of literature and libraries, and within the protection of its walls and in Cathedral and parochial schools, all the education that was given in Western Europe was imparted. Learning was almost exclusively a monopoly of the clergy. To a monk,—the monk of Yarrow, the Venerable Bede,—is accorded the honor of being the Father of English learning. The great universities of Paris, Bologna, Prague and Oxford grew up under the patronage of the Church. Charlemagne seems to have been the first Christian prince to have statesmanlike, howbeit, imperfect, presentiments of the later movement of popular education.

* A paper read at the Parliament of Religions, in Chicago, September 17 1893.

Here and there we find a council, like that of Lambeth (1281), calling upon priests to instruct the young; and here and there a catechism, like that of Ottfried in the ninth century, is prepared for their use. Not a nobler thing is recorded of the great Chancellor Gerson than that he spent his last days teaching children.

In the fifteenth century the seeds were sown from which our modern institutions of learning and plans of education have sprung. The Renaissance in Italy, with the writings of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio; the Fall of Constantinople, in 1453, involving the dispersion of Greek scholars over Western Europe; Humanism represented by such men as Erasmus and Agricola, Beza and Zwingli, More and Colet, indicated the mighty movement of an awakened intellectual life, and called the attention of enthusiastic constituencies to the higher pursuits of intellectual culture. It remained for the Reformers to open up the paths of popular education. Both movements,—the literary and the religious,—were aided beyond the power of computation by the printing-presses of Gutenberg and Fust. By pointing with fresh emphasis to the rights of the individual man before the Creator, and his immediate personal accountability to the divine government, the Reformation was compelled to foster general culture so that each man might for himself search out the truths contained in the Word of God, and be able to give a reasonable statement of his faith. Under its impulse the nations of Europe started as a strong man to run the race of modern progress and civilization. Combating the notion that “ignorance is the mother of devotion,” the Reformers insisted upon the principle that intelligence and learning are bulwarks of sound religion.

Luther went far in the direction of popular education in his address to the German nobles (1520), and his little book addressed to the civil magistrates of German cities. “Even if there were no souls,” he writes, “and we had not the least need of schools and the languages, for the sake of the Scriptures and of God, this one reason would suffice for the existence of

schools everywhere, both for boys and girls, namely: that the world also needs accomplished men and women for maintaining its outward temporal prosperity." In a letter to the Elector of Saxony, in 1526, he laid down the principle that the State has a right to compel attendance upon its schools, as well as to enforce measures for their support.

Calvin, like Luther, Eccolampadius, and other Reformers, did not consider it beneath his dignity to utilize his learning for the benefit of children. He placed general education and catechetical instruction at the basis of the Genevan republic. During his first residence in Geneva he prepared a catechism (1536), and later sent forth new editions, the first French edition, with questions and answers, being in 1541. From the first the ministers of Geneva were incessantly active, both in catechizing and preaching. The clergy of all the Protestant churches gave much care to the instruction of the children in the catechism, and this catechetical instruction was the immediate forerunner of daily schools for instruction in all knowledge. The conception of the public school, as Heppé* has said, could only grow up out of the principles of Protestantism; not at once, however, into full form, but gradually, as the Protestant churches felt the need of it.

Presbyterianism—and I use the term as inclusive of all the branches of the Reformed Church which are confederated together in the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance—sharing the principles of the Reformation, has always advocated sound ministerial learning and popular education. In developing this proposition, it may be done without attempting to disparage the influence of other types of Christian doctrine and ritual upon popular education. As Ambrose once said, "There ought to be no strife but conference among the servants of Christ." At this parliament it is not the purpose that any comparison should be made in a spirit of rivalry, by which any real or fancied superiority of the system of the Reformed churches be established, but only that the truth be positively presented.

* *Geschichte des Protestantischen Schulwesens*, I, 3.

I. THE ADAPTATION OF PRESBYTERIANISM TO FOSTER EDUCATION appears in the emphasis it lays upon the *sermon*. In its public worship the exposition of the Word has been the conspicuous element. The clergyman is chiefly a preacher and teacher. The sermon is not principally an exhortation, but an instructive discourse designed to present to the mind the teachings of the Bible, and to train it to grasp them. The Reformed pulpit from Zürich to Edinburgh became famous. The literature of the old Puritan pulpit is large, often profound, and some of it classic for the English student of his language.

The worship of the Reformed churches does not make its primary appeal to the æsthetic tastes or the emotional nature, but to the intellect and the conscience. Including the two elements of a message from God to be delivered and an offering to God to be rendered, it has laid emphasis upon the former. Some of the Reformed Churches have used liturgies; even the Presbyterian discipline permits their use. But everywhere among all the branches of the Reformed Church the sermon has been exalted. The minister's functions have made it necessary that the ministry be thoroughly trained, and this foremost among those functions—the didactic function—has involved the intellectual training and development of congregations.

A second element of adaptation in Presbyterianism to promote education is its *doctrinal system*. Some of the creeds of the Reformed Churches, notably those of the Westminster Divines and the Synod of Dort, have been widely condemned for seeking to give an exhaustive statement of all God's counsels from eternity. They have no doubt ventured too far in this regard, in comparison, for example, with the more modest and milder treatment in the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession; but these statements have had the advantage of being fitted to call forth and to exercise the metaphysical powers of the mind. Perhaps in no other Church has doctrinal preaching been so generally practiced as in the Scotch Presbyterian churches and their offspring in America and the British colonies. The creeds and catechisms of the Reformed Churches

were intended to be studied, not only by the ministry, but by the people. They were to be taught and expounded in the family circle. Their structure and statement of doctrine appeals to the intellect; the effort required to understand them is itself a mental discipline.

The adaptation of the Presbyterian system to promote education shows itself again in the prominence it gives to the *activity* of the laity. Upon the layman, in conjunction with the clergyman, devolves the administration of the Church. Church government ultimately starts from the congregation, and is vested in its representatives, who, with the ministry, determine doctrine and execute law. The Reformed Churches reject the theory of *ecclesia in episcopo* in the strict or modified sense. "The people," says Dr. Hodge, "have a substantive part in the government of the Church." Where the determination of doctrine and Church discipline rests so largely with the congregation as represented by its chosen elders, it is of greatest importance for the well-being of the Church that the laity be not only a pious company of worshipers, but also a well-instructed body, capable of intelligently conceiving the doctrines of the Church and wisely administering its laws.

Then the Presbyterian system has always emphasized a personal acquaintance with the Scriptures. In the Bible itself is the authority of the Bible lodged. Not the clergy, nor yet the courts of the Church, are ultimate tribunals. The Scripture itself is the final tribunal of faith. Each is under obligation to interpret it for himself, and has the right to make his final appeal to it. As the Scriptures are the infallible rule of faith and conduct, it is the duty of the Church to put them into the hands of all men, and to see to it that they are helped in every way to an intelligent and correct understanding of their truths. The most conspicuous place in the sanctuary is occupied by the sacred volume. In the family it is to be studied and taught. To each individual it is to serve as a lamp unto the feet and a light to the path. When the preacher addresses his congregation, he introduces his words with the call, "Let us hear the Word of God."

The Scriptures are themselves a library—"the divine library," as Jerome called them—and an intelligent acquaintance with their contents is a liberal education. They are so rich that no ordinary man can devote himself to their study with intelligence and prayer without finding secrets of wisdom he has never heard from a human master. It is most probable that the Reformed Churches will continue, as in the past so in the future, to insist upon the thorough training of the ministry in the letter and the doctrines of the Scriptures, as of incomparably more value than any other attainments; and they will demand that their theological teachers be most wary and cautious in announcing any views that call in question their truthful accuracy, even in matters which are not themselves essential to that body of truth for which the Scriptures were given by inspiration of God.

Thus, by the stress it lays on the sermon and the teaching function of the ministry, by its analytic treatment of doctrine in its creeds, by the prominence it gives to the laity in the administration of Church government, and by the solemn stress it lays upon the use of the Scriptures by every man, the system of the Reformed Churches proves its fitness to train the intellect and foster general education.

II. THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION UNDER THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM—In his Ecclesiastical Polity of 1541, John Calvin provided for teachers of the classic languages and the natural sciences, as well as of the Christian doctrines. In Switzerland and in Holland, where the Reformed tenets were generally adopted, the school flourished. It was the boast in Friesland that the fisherman in his hut could read the Scriptures and discuss their interpretation. I shall confine myself to the working of the system in Great Britain and the United States.

As early as 1558, and before the principles of the Reformation were authoritatively recognized in Scotland, John Knox, in a letter from Geneva entitled, a "Brief Exhortation to England," declared that "for the preservation of religion it is most

expedient that schools be universally erected in all cities and chief towns, and oversight thereof be committed to the magistrates and learned men of said cities and towns." Thus very early in the history of the English Reformation and stimulated by Calvin's example, the future leader of Scotch Presbyterianism called for popular and thorough education.

The Church in Scotland, from 1560 to 1633, had control of schools and education. The State, during this period, made no provision for this cause, but left the matter wholly to Church agencies. After 1633 the State made partial provision, and since 1872 it has assumed entire responsibility for the primary education of the people.

Prior to the Reformation, Scotland had the three universities of St. Andrews, Aberdeen and Glasgow, and grammar schools were established in the principal towns. These were further developed by the Presbyterians, and arrangements gradually made for the establishment of primary schools throughout the land. The First Book of Discipline (1560) declared that every considerable parish should have a school with a schoolmaster fit to teach the grammar and the Latin tongue, and that in small towns the reader or minister should take charge of the instruction of the youth. The closest connection between the Church and the school was maintained. Religious instruction was, as might be expected, regarded as of most importance. In the Education Act of Parliament of 1567, it is declared to be "tinsel baith of their bodies and of their soulis gif God's word be not ruted." In many parishes the minister continued for years to perform the functions of the schoolmaster. A frequent reference in old church and Presbytery records* is, "to the school at the Kirk." The session of Lasswarde (1615) instructed their clerk to "ring the bell ilk morning at seven hours, as near as he can be his judgment, to advertise the bairns to come to school."

For many a long day the Scotch schoolmaster had to pass an examination before Presbytery "in respect to morality and

* Edgar's *Old Church Life in Scotland*, 2 vols.

religion, and of such branches of literature as by the majority might be deemed most necessary and important for the parish." The sessions arranged for his stipend, and he occupied a position of honor in the parish second only to the minister, often assisting him in the services of the sanctuary. Singing or song schools were also established throughout Scotland, and one is reminded by them of Chaucer's reference to singing in the monastic school where the boys

"Acquired each, year by year,
Such kind of learning as was taught them there—
That is to say, to sing and read, as good
Small children ought to do in their childhood."

Crossing the seas to our own land we find the Calvinists of New England exercised most deeply, and almost from the moment of their landing, on the subject of schools and colleges. The schools and colleges of New England, which have been its glory, were in the earlier periods established and maintained under a religious impulse. Harvard, leading all in 1636, was dedicated to God and His Church. Dartmouth began as an Indian school with the motto *vox clamantis in deserto*. Mather, speaking of the influence of Harvard, says: "Harvard is a university which hath been to these plantations as Livy saith of Greece for the good of literature there cultivated, *sal gentium*, a seminary for the knowledge of God and a school for logical minds, and a river without the streams whereof these regions would have been mere unwatered places for the devil."

The Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in the Middle Colonies were less alert on the subject of education than the Puritans (and Presbyterians) of New England. This may be in part explained by the relative lack of compactness of their settlements and the heterogeneous elements intermingling in these colonies. For many years the Presbyterians gave a very considerable share of their scholars to Yale College. For the beginning of their denominational schools they look back to the Log College, established a mile from Neshaminy Creek, by Rev. William Tennent, who went to Neshaminy as pastor in

1726. "Whitefield's Journals" have preserved the only extant description of its buildings. "The Log College," he writes, "was 20 feet long and near as many broad, and to me it seemed to resemble the school of the old prophets, for their habitations were mean," etc. "This institution," as Dr. Archibald Alexander says, "was of unspeakable importance" to the Presbyterian Church in this country. Not a vestige of the old building remains.

Princeton, the oldest existing, as it is still the most influential of our Presbyterian centres of education, dates from 1746, its chartered name being the College of New Jersey. Dr. Jonathan Dickinson, one of the most learned theologians of the land in his day, opened the institution in his house at Elizabeth. At his death, a year later, the school was removed to Newark under the presidency of Dr. Aaron Burr, and then to Princeton. The institution has enjoyed the presidency and instruction of some of the most eminent divines in the land, from Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Davies and John Witherspoon, down to Archibald Alexander, the Hodges and James McCosh.

A warm interest was shown by the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain in the growth of Princeton College, and the appeals of Samuel Davies and Gilbert Tennent, who had been sent abroad to present its wants, were answered by a gift fund of £4000. On May 31, 1754, the General Assembly of Scotland "authorized and appointed a collection to be made at the church doors of all parishes in Scotland, . . . for the Young Daughter, because it was sensible that the encouraging of the said Princeton College is of great importance to the interests of religion and learning, and the support and further advancement of the kingdom of Christ in those parts of the world."

Three years prior to this date, in 1751-52, the Rev. Michael Schlatter, representing the scattered German Reformed churches of Pennsylvania, presented the cause of religion and education among them before the Synod and churches of Holland. Twelve thousand pounds were raised in Holland, the interest of

which was to go "towards the support of ministers and school-masters in Pennsylvania." Through the efforts of David Thomson, pastor of the English Reformed Church in Amsterdam, who had been stirred up by Schlatter, a large sum was raised in England for the maintenance of free schools among the Germans in America,* and also a fund by the churches of Scotland.

The honor of establishing the first theological seminary on the continent is claimed by the Dutch Reformed Church in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in 1784, and also by the Associate Reformed Church in 1794, at Service Creek, Pennsylvania.

The seminary at Princeton was founded in 1812 (five years after Andover), and was followed by the Presbyterian seminaries of Lane, Auburn, Xenia, Allegheny, Union, McCormick, Columbia, Union (Va.), Danville, Lebanon (Tenn.), Bloomfield, Dubuque, San Francisco, Omaha, Louisville and the German Reformed Seminaries at Lancaster (organized in 1825, at Carlisle, and in 1836 removed to Mercersburg) and at Tiffin, Ohio.

The Reformed Churches of the United States have wrought by organized effort to advance the cause of education. The Northern Presbyterian Church, for example, systematically promotes the cause of ministerial education by her Board of Education, founded in 1819, and of general education by her Boards of Freedmen, Publication, Home and Foreign Missions, and distinctively through the Board of Aid for Colleges and Academies. Since the organization of the last Board, in 1883, its yearly receipts have grown from \$15,000 to \$139,000 in 1892 and 1893. From the first Records of the Presbyterian Church, in 1706, to the Records of the last Synod, organized on the Pacific slope, frequent references will be found to actions concerning education.

No American friendly to Christianity can travel abroad in the Orient or heathen lands without observing with pride the institutions planted by the Calvinistic Churches of America. Robert College, a noble monument of Congregational liberality

* Briggs, *Presbyterianism*, p. 313.

and scholarship, and the Girls' School at Sentari, are bright lights on the Bosphorus. The Presbyterian College at Beyrut, Syria, and the United Presbyterian College at Assiout, on the Nile, are fountains of learning and civilization to the people among whom they are located. The primary schools and colleges established by the benevolence of the Reformed churches abroad are a standing testimony to the interest they take in the work of education. A long list of eminent names associated with this general cause will at once suggest themselves from Calvin and Beza to Chalmers and Duff, and the great host of teachers from the Reformed Churches in our own land from the college president, to the teacher in the humblest mission school for the Indian or Colored people.

III. PRESBYTERIANISM AND EDUCATION BY THE STATE.—

The Presbyterian Church favors and supports the public school. No less an authority than Mr. Bancroft has declared Calvin to be "the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools." * The American system of free schools may be dated from 1642, when orders were issued in Massachusetts' Colony that "every township, after the Lord had increased them to fifty householders, should have a school, and that all children be taught to read and write; and, so soon as the number of households be increased to 100, a grammar school should be established with a teacher able to prepare the youth for the university."

It may be regarded as an axiom, generally accepted among the Reformed Churches of the land, that it is an imperative duty of the State to maintain schools to which all shall have free access. Religious considerations of a general nature, as well as the consideration of patriotism, obligate the State to compel all to receive an elementary education. This, however, does not imply that the State should make attendance upon its own schools obligatory. The Presbyterian Church North has often shown its attitude to the public school through the deliverances of its General Assembly. In 1870 it declared "the public

* *Lit. and Hist. Miscellanea*, p. 406.

school to be the most precious heirloom of American liberty. . . . No other agency, if we except the Church of God, has had so large a share in laying the foundation of popular intelligence, virtue and freedom. It cannot be endangered without peril to the vital interests of American society."

The present prevailing state of opinion, no doubt, is that the State is not justified in including religion among the branches of instruction taught. The composition of American society is too complex, and the rivalry of denominational beliefs too energetic to admit at the present moment of an agreement upon the nature and extent of the religious teaching, even if such were deemed expedient. No type of Christian faith is at present so overwhelmingly in the preponderance as to render it justifiable to make it the religious standard in the school supported by general taxation. The spirit and the letter of our republican institutions are against the sectarian use of public funds. Any attempt to wrest the public funds for the promotion of sectarian interests cannot be looked upon with tolerance. It jeopardizes the whole fabric of the public school.

The public school may not be sectarian. It must not be disrespectful to the Christian religion. No element of teaching should be admitted that antagonizes it, and no teacher is worthy of his position who casts slings at its doctrines or constituency. The object of the public school is to give an elementary education in whatsoever is distinctly pertinent to the present life and the relation of man to his fellow-man.

Differences of opinion still exist in regard to the wisdom of retaining a simple form of religious exercises at the opening of the school, when there is any expressed objection to them. But, if I judge rightly, public opinion in the Protestant churches is growingly in favor of excluding them altogether. What was once justifiable when a constituency was predominantly, if not exclusively, Protestant cannot be regarded as such where Catholic or Jewish, or other non-sympathetic elements are introduced. By abandoning an opening prayer and the reading of King James' Version, do we abandon the schools of the

State to irreligion? By no means. A portion of the community simply relinquishes its preference for the sake of the public peace, to avoid giving occasion of offense to fellow-citizens of equal rights with itself, and to take out of the way any rock upon which the public school system of the land may be threatened with foundering.

To declare that the "presence of the Bible in every public school is an indispensable condition of their existence" must be regarded as a rash and exasperating form of statement, so long as the usual constituents of an elementary education are in themselves deemed to be of any value whatsoever. The public school is not godless because no religious instruction is given in it. It is not godless so long as reading, writing and arithmetic are taught, any more than a pear tree is a thorn bush because it does not bear luscious Bartlett pears. It is not godless when fundamental principles of Christian philosophy animate the conduct of teachers.

What the attitude of the great Roman Catholic body of our population (now apparently hostile to all forms of non-sectarian education) may involve, no one can at present adequately forecast. It seems, however, to the writer, that while the principle is maintained without flinching that no State aid shall go to sectarian schools, Protestants must seek to perpetuate the public school system by a readiness to consult with that very large and respectable body of the community which attacks the present management of the public school, and to come to some amicable agreement, if at all possible, with it, on the basis of American citizenship, concerned for the perpetuity of the American State. Should, however, the sentiment of the Catholic hierarchy and people, in localized communities or states where their numbers are relatively large, still insist upon sectarian appropriations, that catastrophe must be averted and the free school be perpetuated by adjusting taxation with reference to a large reduction in the compass of our common school education itself and a limitation of age in the pupils qualified to attend. If the only alternative, however, be sectarian appropriations or no

school system maintained at the public expense, the matter would probably end in the acceptance of the latter. Private enterprise and patriotism would, no doubt, be sufficient to meet the terrible emergency. It would seem, however, that it was possible to give some quietus to the antagonism on this question, from the standpoint of American citizenship, by an agreement to limit the public school education to elementary branches, acknowledged by all to be of value, and to exclude all things but the prosecution of them.

IV. PRESBYTERIANISM AND DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES.—

The maintenance of denominational institutions has grown out of the exigency of meeting the demand for higher schools of learning and from the denominational instinct to keep under churchly influences the children within a denomination. It is not of the genius of the Reformed Churches to antagonize state institutions. Its interest is to support them. The universities of the Reformed type of theology in Germany, Switzerland, and Holland are sustained by the State. A pressing necessity is felt of institutions managed by denominational control vouching for the Christian character of the influences brought to bear upon our students. This does not mean that the control should be clerical or sectarian, but generously Christian and religious. In an address before one of the councils of the Pan Presbyterian Alliance, Dr. McCosh tried to establish two principles, "that it is not just the duty or office of a Church to manage a college, . . . but churches should see to it that religion has a place where young men are to be trained." Too close a denominational control will inevitably limit the sphere of an institution's usefulness in our country, while all lack of Church control is apt to be attended with a total disregard of religious observances, if not religious principles.

A growing constituency is demanding that at our colleges something beyond mere respect be had for religion. Parents are not satisfied with a curriculum requiring nothing more than an attendance upon lectures and examinations. They ask that for their children, at the formative period of college life, a

positive Christian influence be brought to bear upon them by the professors. While as little compulsion as possible should be employed in the matter of religious observance, a definite regard for Christianity should be had in outward exercises, and definite courses of instruction be given on religious subjects. The great facts and influences of the Bible are certainly no less worthy of attention in the college than the facts and influences of the Roman Empire. The first regulations of Harvard College bearing on religion belong to another period of our history, as when they enjoin that "every one shall so exercise himself in the reading of the Scriptures twice a day that he may be able to give an account of his proficiency therein." But, inapplicable as such a rule would be to-day, it seems to be felt that we have gone too far in the other direction, and there are marked signs of an intention to correct the mistake.

The Reformed Churches are most solemnly pledged to the cause of education, and wherever they have flourished the school and the university have been established. As God is for every man who wills to find Him, so this world, with all its realms of created work and curious forces, and all the chambers of man's historic activity, are to be made free to every man to study. It is to the interest of true religion that all true science and art and culture be magnified and encouraged, and the acquaintance with them be extended to the widest possible constituency. In this way man will come to display more generally his own greatness, and, as through an increased lens in the telescope revealing larger constellations, he will come to know the greatness of God and be led in reverence to exclaim: "How excellent is Thy name in all the earth!" We are learning more fully the meaning of both propositions in the statement that godliness is profitable for the life that now is and the life that is to come. To the Egypt of the past we leave as the task, overshadowing all others, to compose a Book of the Dead. We live, and we foster all knowledge of life from that of the hyssop in the wall to the sweep of God's mighty hand across the nightly heavens. The excellency of all knowledge, the consummation of all edu-

cation, the highest reach of wisdom, is to find out God in Christ. The great philosopher Schelling, writing in the album of an American student, knew no better words to inscribe than the Greek of St. Paul: * "In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." He is the wisdom of God, and above all other schools is the school of personal companionship with Him. To know Him is the highest achievement of an education.

*Col. 2: 3. The student was the Rev. Daniel W. Poor, D.D.

Jacksonville, Ill.

V.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.*

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM, D.D.

THE great tenacity with which the Reformed Church in the United States has ever clung to its peculiar system of *educational religion* is one of its distinguishing features. I say "*its peculiar system*," not to insinuate that no other Christian denomination has an educational system, but rather to note the fact, that with us it has a different meaning and a different purpose.

With most Christian denominations, education means a training of the natural powers for the purpose of leading to conversion. Working on this foundation, they do not practice Infant Baptism, or, if they do, they fail to recognize its grace-bearing character, and accordingly they ignore any effect which it may be supposed to produce upon the inner life of the child, and proceed with his education just exactly as if he had not been baptized.

With us, on the contrary (and two or three other churches), education means a leading out, or training of the Christian life already implanted in the soul, with the purpose of nurturing that life in the Lord.

But most Protestant Churches have fallen away, practically, from this educational, and, as we believe, scriptural system of religion, and substituted for it, the more popular and pre-

* The above paper was read before the Ohio Synod at the Centennial Service held on Friday afternoon and evening, October 13, 1893, at Bloomville O., in honor of the hundred years of the independent existence of the Reformed Church in the United States.

vailing system of *Revivalism*. Let me be fully understood here. I am not finding fault with the Revival System, nor do I wish to discredit it in any particular. What I wish to emphasize is the fact, *that it is not our system*, and that whenever it has made itself felt in any of our congregations, and wherever it prevails among them, they have ceased in any true sense to be Reformed, because they have forsaken and set aside the Reformed System.

Our Church has, from the beginning, firmly stood for the principle of educational religion, believing it to be original and in harmony with Holy Scripture. Any other system is foreign to its spirit and genius. It can not admit of any additions or subtractions. It must stand or fall alone. It is either right or wrong, and no amount of manipulation or tinkering can make it harmonize with systems of a different or less ancient order. It must stand upon its own merits or fall by its demerits.

It claims to be Scriptural in the broadest, fullest and most liberal sense, not depending on isolated passages of holy writ to sustain its position, but laying hold, rather, of the general inner sense and meaning of divine revelation by faith; it relies on that, and not solely on the letter, as the norm and guide of our spiritual life.

It claims to be churchly, in a high and universal sense, holding the Church to be the body of Christ, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all, and that, as such, it has Christ for its Head and us for its members. The Church, according to this system, is a divine-human constitution of grace, carrying within it all the means necessary for the conversion and salvation of the world. And while outwardly it has different forms of government, and is capable of suiting itself to all times, places, circumstances and peoples, it is ever the same Holy Catholic Church of Christ, fully equipped, divinely appointed, and humanly manned, to carry the gospel to every creature.

The educational system, as held by the Reformed Church, is *also sacramental*, holding the sacraments of Baptism, and the

Holy Supper to be *essential marks of the true Church of Christ, and divinely appointed channels or means of grace*, through which the divine life is communicated to, and nourished in, the believer. And any system of religion which ignores, or sets aside, or speaks lightly of these grace-bearing institutions, is entirely of another spirit, and can in no manner be harmonized or joined with this system, any more than oil and water can unite and become one substance.

This system further claims *that no manner of education, in the sphere of nature, which ignores the Sacraments, can change an unconverted sinner into an immaculate saint, or make him spiritually different from what he was before.*

Its principle is fully represented and embodied in the Heidelberg Catechism, and finds devotional utterance and appropriate forms of worship, in the *Directory of Worship*.

The Catechism bears testimony, both by the form in which its instructions are molded and by its personal address to the Catechumen, of the position now taken with reference to the claims of the system.

It makes personal experimental religion a fundamental principle, and addresses the Catechumen with personal questions with reference to his personal salvation, and it puts answers in his mouth, which imply that he is already a Christian. Accordingly, it is easy to see that it assumes that the divine life has been implanted in him, and that it is about to be developed and nourished in the Lord.

This system is not just the same as that represented, ordinarily, in the Sunday-schools of the day. And, although the Sunday-school is called an educational institution, and certainly has a great work to do by way of instructing the scholars in the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, its geography and chronology, and in showing the relations, correspondencies and antagonisms of sacred to contemporaneous history; yet its educational standpoint is widely different from that of the educational system of religion, as apprehended and taught by the Reformed Church.

It must be admitted that individuals in the Reformed Church, either from lack of proper training or from personal predilection, have substituted the Revival for the educational system of religion. But this admission does not alter the state of the case, or in any way invalidate the claim, that the Church, as such, has never repudiated its own legitimate system for the sake of another. But, on the contrary, it has clung to it, as a vital principle, true loyalty to which is essential to its very existence, if its distinctive character is to be maintained and its separate existence justified.

A falling away from this standpoint must involve, for the Reformed Church, therefore, a departure from the whole system on which it rests, and a sundering of the ties which bind us to the faith and cultus of our own Reformed fathers, and the embracing of a system of which they practically knew nothing, and which, if they could rise from their graves, they would repudiate as a foreign innovation.

Let it be remembered here that I am not comparing or contrasting two systems, to discredit the one and to defend the other; I am only stating obvious facts, which no one, who is capable of comprehending their differences, can deny, whether his personal predilections favor the one or the other. These two systems are not the same, and, as already plainly stated, they cannot unite or assimilate without losing their distinctive characteristics.

It is evident that the educational system of the Reformed Church is not the popular system. On the contrary, churches which have adopted the Revival System have far outstripped us in numerical growth, as well as in wealth and outward influence, so that, during the century of our independent existence, many denominations have sprung into existence as if by magic, and distanced us in the race for popular favor, and so they have left us far in the rear, and complacently look upon us as the "antiquated relic of a by-gone age"—a petrified fossil, whose life, if it ever had life, has gone out in darkness. Our special love for the Church, and our faith in the grace-bearing

character of the word and sacraments, and our loyalty to the divinely appointed means of grace (as we believe them to be), are only so many evidences to *them* that we are far behind the spirit of the age, which has been able to discover, and successfully use, so many modern inventions for the conversion of sinners and the rapid spread of the Gospel.

Our Church and her system are not popular. But does it therefore follow that others are all right and we all wrong? I think not. On the contrary, I believe that though numerically small among the thousands of Israel, we are, among the churches, like the leaven in the meal. Others have rushed on with lightning speed in their work of growth and outward influence and fame. We have plodded silently along, holding fast to the old-fashioned Scriptural means of grace, interpreting their meaning, according to the symbol of our faith, the Heidelberg Catechism. We have held on to the practice of baptizing our children into Christ, thereby consecrating them to God as His children, who thus makes them new creatures in Christ Jesus, by the operation of the Holy Spirit. As children of our heavenly Father, we have kept on catechizing and nurturing them in the Lord, confirming them at the proper age, and sending them out into the wide world, imbued with this faith in which they have been nurtured, and carrying it with them, as the inheritance of a glorious patrimony. With this faith, they have mingled with others, gradually, silently and surely leavening them with the power of their faith, until all the denominations of the land have felt its living influence.

Besides this, the literature of our Church is attracting attention outside of our own denominational limits, being read and studied by leading men in other churches; and the principles of Reformed theology are apprehending them with an irresistible grasp, and leading them to adopt the very things they once repudiated. It is, therefore, evident that our educational system is exerting a wider and more powerful influence than appears on the surface. And this influence for good is all the more effective from the fact that those, who are the subjects of

its power, are unconscious of the source from whence it comes. This may appear somewhat bold, but any one familiar with current theological history in the United States, must see that the theological leaders in most Protestant churches, are slowly, but surely, gravitating towards the Christo-logical and Christo-centric system of the Heidelberg Catechism. And, at the same time, the holy sacraments, which have suffered so much at the hands of Protestant writers, are beginning to receive due honor, while the Church is beginning to be acknowledged as the "pillar and ground of truth," and "the body of Christ, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."

Thus the educational system of religion is working its way, and the Church, which a few years ago was supposed not to believe in conversion, is furnishing lessons of instruction to some, who, perhaps, would resent the allegation; for it seems to have become a settled purpose, in some quarters, to affect entire ignorance of the Reformed Church, in its true historical character.

All this may sound to some ears like presumptuous boasting, but if, any bring such a charge, we simply reply, "As the truth of Christ is in us, this boasting shall not be stopped in us." (See 2 Cor. xi: 10.) If any one will carefully investigate the history of the past century of our Church, he will be able to verify the truth of these statements, unless he is too blinded by prejudice to see the truth when it is laid bare before his eyes. Or again, if any one will read the reviews of the various religious denominations, he will find articles advocating doctrines and practices, which were taught fifty years ago by leading writers of the Reformed Church, for which they were denounced and ostracized as heretics and schismatics. These views are beginning to pass current now as common property; but writers of the present day seem wholly unconscious of the fact that what they are teaching *as something new*, was held and taught by the Reformed Church before they were born.

The recent movement in the Presbyterian Church, regarding the revision of its standards, is an evident advance towards

the position of the Heidelberg Catechism, as understood by the Reformed Church, however seldom that symbol receives creditable mention by their writers and speakers. The so-called "New Theology," now taught at Andover, is Reformed Theology, only disguised and marred by glosses which we cannot endorse. But, divested of these, that theology is found to be an exposition of the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism, and in harmony with its educational system.

From a consideration of these undeniable facts, and others which might be added, it is easy to see that the educational system of the Reformed Church, embodied in the Heidelberg Catechism, affords a broad basis on which all Protestant Churches can, and probably will, unite. And all efforts hitherto made towards a consensus of Christian doctrine, point towards this system, however much the Catechism itself is ignored.

The evident reason for this is, that while this Catechism is free from the peculiarities of the other confessions of faith, it embraces the fundamental and essential principles of them all; and, at the same time, while it condemns and makes no compromise with error, yet it exhibits the irenical spirit of the Master.

But chief among the excellencies of this system is the reverence for the divine ordinances, and its resolute opposition to that restless spirit, which so readily dispenses with the appointed means of grace, and substitutes any innovation that promises greater outward results and quicker returns.

Religion, from this standpoint, begins in the cradle, where the infant of a few days, or weeks, is consecrated to God in holy baptism, and thereby becomes the subject of that grace in which it stands, and is permitted to rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

At this initial point, according to the educational system of religion, the germ of the new life is deposited in the soul, which, subsequently, under the proper conditions, passes through a course of development, which reaches its maturity only, when the child has attained the stature of perfect manhood in Jesus Christ.

This perfect state, however, is only reached, finally, in glorification, at the right hand of God. Education, in this case, means the leading out of the new life, and the Holy Spirit molds it more and more, as the training proceeds, into the perfect image of Christ, which is the goal and crown of the whole Christian life.

Such, in brief, is the educational system of the Reformed Church, as embodied doctrinally in the catechism and embraced in the Directory of Worship and the Hymnal, in devotional forms, and carried out practically in the daily life of the truest and best members of the Church. For this system, and its salutary influence upon the Church, and, through the Church, on Protestantism in the United States, during the last hundred years, we ought to be profoundly thankful to our Heavenly Father. It especially calls for thanksgiving that He has given us the grace and the grit to hold on with a steadfast purpose to our time-honored, though unpopular system, when a falling away to "new things" might have brought us into more prominence and gratified a natural ambition for display. For this tenacity to right principle, regardless of outside pressure and the desire for applause, evinces the fact that we cared more for truth than for popularity, and that we were content to remain in the background, rather than barter the scriptural, and time-honored methods of our educational system of religion, for the modern inventions which promised notoriety and applause. We believe that in the end the educational system will prevail.

Let us render thanksgiving to God that He has given us this noble system, and that we have been able, by His grace and Spirit, to preserve it amid the din and turmoil of conflicting parties, through the century whose triumphs we joyfully celebrate to-day.

VI

THE BENEVOLENT WORK OF THE PAST CENTURY IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.*

BY REV C. CLEVER, D. D.

THE benevolent work of the earlier years of this ecclesiastical century does not seem to speak very well for the charity and public spirit of our forefathers. They sang lustily, Thank God salvation is free, and then went to their farms and merchandise, intimating at least, that if God wanted the heathen to be converted, He would accomplish the task without any aid from the Pennsylvania Germans. They would have applauded to the echo that moderator who commanded young Carey to be silent upon the duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the Gospel among the heathen, saying, "Young man, sit down! When God pleases to convert the heathen He will do it without your aid or mine." We have no part or lot in the everlasting glory and honor of that piety, that prompted the establishment of the great missionary societies at the close of the last or in the earlier years of the present century. The Reformed Church in the United States did not cast in its lot with the different agencies which sprang up in the heart of the Christian Church, as an answer to the awful assaults made upon the citadel of Truth. When the Ark of God was in the hands of the Deistic Philistines, our Church folded its hands in a

*The contributions and struggles which characterized the Church in the establishment of its institutions of learning are not referred to in this article, since they are accessible to all in the two works prepared by Dr. Theodore Appel, entitled "College Recollections" and "The Beginnings of the Theological Seminary," and in "The History of Heidelberg College," by Dr. G. W. Williard.

slumber, that had about it the chill of death. We have no missionary heroes like Carey or Elliot or Martyn or Brainard. We have our Schlatter, but he died of a broken heart, being left severely alone by the Church which he loved so well, but which he could not arouse from its slumbers. There is no prominent Reformed name among the founders of the American Bible Society, the American Sunday-school Union or the American Tract Society, all of which had for their ends the bearing of the Gospel Message, out into the highways and hedges of this new world. It finally dawned upon a few elect spirits that a Christianity that did not drive its possessor to the work of saving the world had not been born from above, and could not in any way be made to square with that apostolic zeal which turned the world upside down. It had about it a heartless selfishness as remote from the spirit of Christ as the East is from the West.

At last the sound of the going in the tops of our mulberry trees indicated clearly that God was commanding us to move forward. The line of quiet reserve was to become the line of battle. The other branches of the Church were being stirred, and the leaves of the tree which are for the healing of the nations were falling upon blistered and bruised humanity. Men were going forth with a prayerful determination to conquer this new world for Christ. The Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Methodist and the Baptist Churches were the pioneers in this magnificent Home Missionary Work. Yankee snap proved too vigorous in this race with the slow-plodding Germans, whether marshalled under the banner of Zwingli or Luther. It planned the work and put the whole missionary machinery in motion, while the Germans were settling in their minds whether they should compete in this glorious campaign with their more energetic brethren or not.

As a Church we have had since the beginning an immense missionary field. Macedonian cries, however, have fallen upon our ears in vain. Fields crowned with harvests which should have stirred the souls of our whole communion, were left for

others to gather. As late as 1866 the President of the Board of Home Missions tells the General Synod at Dayton, "Doors of entrance for evangelical zeal stood widely open for us in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburg, Buffalo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Omaha, New Orleans, not to enumerate a large list of smaller, but rapidly-growing cities, East and West, into which the Church was invited and where she might have found abundant ready material for rearing congregations and multiplying her numbers; but they stood open for the most part in vain. Either they were not entered at all, or the efforts and aid they demanded were so feebly put forth and so inadequately sustained by requisite pecuniary assistance, that but little was accomplished. It is sad and humiliating to refer to these facts and to reflect upon the irreparable losses which the Church has suffered in consequence of her apathy and neglect. But it is far more painful and humiliating to consider the inexcusable indifference thus betrayed to the spiritual interests of thousands who had the strongest filial claims to her parental sympathy and solicitude."

In 1819 the Home Mission work began to be organized. Men felt that the few individual efforts, which here and there disturbed the chill of indifference that had thrown its death-like stillness over all our borders, were not enough. Fragmentary efforts when properly crystalized and flashing with the divine-human light and love of the Saviour, could do far more than the same amount of energy scattered about loosely. The earlier records of the Society and the reports to the Synods are so incomplete that a tabulated statement is out of the question. In 1835 the Board of Home Missions reported that during the preceding year the startling amount of \$97.20½ had been contributed, and that \$54.31 had been expended, leaving a balance in the treasury of \$42.89½. When the Society had been in existence forty years it had expended \$36,223.00, or an average of about \$900 per year. In 1859, when the number of communicants were about 70,000, the treasurer reported about \$4,000, or about an average

of six cents per member; and this, it must be remembered, was when there were no Orphans' Homes or Foreign Missionary Societies, and only a very slim effort to do foreign missionary work. From this time on a new breath of missionary zeal seems to have fallen upon the Church. The forty years of wandering in the desert wastes of indifference and want of appreciation of the serious responsibilities which Almighty God had imposed upon us came to an end, and we prepared to go over into the promised land. In 1859 there were 21 stations and 20 missionaries under the care of the Board, and the amount of money raised was \$4,114.15. In 1866 there were 60 missionaries and 72 mission points under the care of the Board, and the Treasurer reported receipts from October 18, 1865, to November 25, 1866 amounting to \$14,026.81, and there was a balance in his hands, after all the debts had been paid, of \$116.59. This seemed also to have been a glorious season for church extension work. The Treasurer reports receipts from October 19, 1865, to November 19, 1866, amounting to \$12,752.49. The Home Missionary contribution of that year, including church extension, reached \$26,779.80, almost 25 cents per member. The following nine years there was necessitated a change in the policy of carrying forward our missionary work. It was the period when our prophets could not see eye to eye. They sank back into a condition of ecclesiastical anarchy, when there was no King in our Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes, and regarded with holy discontent that which his brother of the other side did, no matter how much the blessing of heaven rested upon him. Nobody seemed to care enough to gather together the statistical report of missionary success and expenditure. Synods and Classes formed boards, and in a sort of a go-as-you-please way the work survived, and it should be humbly acknowledged before that God who makes even the wrath of man to praise Him, with some degree of success. The Treasurer of the Church Extension efforts, which had been so prosperous, now finds it a hard task to keep things going. The receipts have

gone down. The \$12,752 of the years 1865-66 have dwindled to \$3,657 in the two years and a half, from 1872. The Treasurer is in debt nearly one thousand dollars, and nobody seemed to feel themselves responsible for his reimbursement.

This abnormal state of things could not continue any length of time. The General Synod at Baltimore, in 1884, appointed a committee to submit a plan by which the work of Home Missions for the entire Reformed Church shall be carried on more efficiently under the direct management of the Board of General Synod. On account of suspicions and jealousies, this sensible as well as constitutional requirement had to wait some time before its completion. But, as is well known in the Church, it has at last been accomplished, with promises of the most gratifying results.

In 1884, there were under the care of all the different boards and societies in the whole Church 142 missions, which were sustained for three years at a cost of \$77,989.79. In the preceding three years, 48 missions had been established, and the fund contributed by the Church had increased \$22,951.61, or an average of \$7,650 per year.

The report of the Board of Home Missions presented to the General Synod at Reading, Pa., reveals the fact that the work is enlarging and the Church is rising more and more to the opportunities which the love of Christ has put in its path. The time has passed by when we can content ourselves with simply gathering in those who are not willing to go into the other denominations. Work among the Hungarians has been abundantly blessed. Other nationalities are appealing to us, and their appeals are not in vain. Church extension seems to have taken on a new lease of life. The spirit of '65 and '66 has come back again, and men are beginning to see that new chapels can not be built upon promises. Missionary societies begin to assume proportions that promise untold blessings for the future. It has dawned upon some few of our lords of creation that we have some Dorcas' and Phœbes' in our Church, who, if given but half of a chance, will put a rattle into some of the old dry

bones of the valley of death that will have about it the thrill of the angelic song that disturbed the slumbering shepherds on the first Christmas morn. We have walked around these inheritances of ours doubting and fearing. It is for us now, with the shout of a king, to go up into them, for the Lord has given them unto us. With the resources that we have at hand, with the forces organized, and with the evidences of a divine purpose to make us a great people, to doubt would be disloyalty, to falter would be sin.

There are now under the control of the Board 137 missions. This is a falling off when compared with three years ago. It should be said, however, that the policy of the Board has been to push the missions into helping themselves as soon as possible, and cuts off a mission that does not give promise of future success. The amount of money contributed by the Church for the last three years was \$124,931 for missionary work, and \$24,872 for church building purposes. The Board has at last reached the sensible conclusion that only the best men should be sent into mission fields, and that no missionary money is so well spent as the difference required to support such a man in a mission and one of those whose position is the result of pity or favoritism. A well paid missionary will bring back into the treasury of the Board a hundred fold; while one who can be had cheap will in the end prove a burden and an absolute loss to the Church.

A bird might as well try to fly with one wing as for a church to expect to prosper with but one form of missionary activity. That individual Christian, who, with a consequential air favors only home missions, has separated ruthlessly what the Lord joined together in a holy estate, and upon which He pronounced heaven's choicest benediction. The salvation of the Sandwich Islander, or of a swarthy spirit of Ethiopia, sends as much of a thrill of joy through the courts of heaven as one who steps into the Church from a gilded palace on Fifth Avenue or from one of the fashionable up-town clubs. The Lord proposed that his ambassadors should go out into all the world and tell the story of Jesus and His love. It

was not very long after the organization of the Board of Home Missions in the Reformed Church before men began taking a wider view. In the proclamation of the Gospel of eternal salvation mountains must vanish away, and in anticipation of that grander revelation of power and love, there dare be no more sea. It must ever be regretted, however, that the Foreign Missionary spirit did not stir in the heart of our Church in the days of the heroic period of Foreign Missionary work. When the work of Foreign Missions began to assume a living form, the Home Mission work said: Brother, where thou goest I will go, and where thou stayest I will stay, thy success shall be my success, and when thou diest I will die, and then and there I will be buried.

While the Synod was in session in Lancaster on the 29th day of September, 1838, the Board of Foreign Missions was organized. There seemed to be an amount of enthusiasm engendered, which gave great hope for succeeding usefulness. Heiner, Berg, Zacharias, Wolf and Ziegler each agreed to raise \$120 apiece. The Synod pledged itself to raise \$945 for the cause. The Rev. Diedrich Willers was President, Rev. Elias Heiner was Vice-President, Rev. Bernard C. Wolf was Corresponding Secretary, Rev. John Cares, Recording Secretary, and John J. Mayer, Treasurer. These were men of good report among the brethren, and the incense of their heroism and sacrifice still lingers around our altars to encourage those who have come after them. The Church did not feel herself able to stand alone. It was content to be a hand-maid to a Board which had reached its majority in this species of work. The American Board, which has always been carried forward in the widest spirit of charity, agreed to become the almoner of our benevolence. One of their missionaries, Rev. Benjamin Schneider, was loaned to us, and we agreed to support him. After several years he returned to the Church of his first choice, and remained a faithful servant of Christ under our banner till the day of his death. In 1845, \$1,568 were raised for this sacred cause. It was in 1840 when our church began

to send her contributions to the American Board, which it continued to do till 1865. In these 25 years there was contributed the sum of \$27,986.90. There has never been any particular acknowledgment of this expenditure, on the part of our Church, in the interest of the spread of Christianity in Turkey. It was but a trifle when compared to some of the more splendid offerings laid upon the common altar for this work. It, however, kept alive the spirit, and formed a comfortable nucleus for that revival of foreign work which began in the year 1873. In 1800 there was a growing self-consciousness, that could not be satisfied any longer in such a dependent position. Men baptized with the spirit of the Christ who was to have the heathen for an inheritance, insisted upon entering upon a wider field of activity and usefulness. After five years of correspondence and committee meetings and resolutions, the Synod decided to establish a mission of its own. The last money was paid into the treasury of the American Board, October 9, 1865. For thirteen years the Foreign Missionary spirit showed itself in a small annual offering for its cause. It remained in the hands of the treasurer until these tidbits and the interest which accrued thereon amounted to \$5,296.39. It was hardly to be expected that a Church without a mission or a missionary, and only the vaguest idea of any aggressive operations, would bring large offerings into the treasury of the Lord. In the meantime, a slight aid had been extended to the German Evangelical Missionary Society, which carried forward a work in Bismampore, India, under the care of one of our ministers, Rev. Oscar T. Lohr, formerly assisted by another of our brethren, Rev. Jacob Houser.

In the year 1873, the Board began to bestir itself again. Japan was selected as the country for future operations. The Church was asked for men and money. It was not till five years later that any definite work was undertaken. At a meeting of the Board in Harrisburg, September 30, 1878, Rev. Ambrose D. Gring was elected missionary, and the Board was authorized to furnish him with the necessary outfit, and send

him forth to Japan. The missionary and his wife reached their place of destination in June, 1879. The first year thereafter the Church contributed \$2,933.10, the second year \$5,094.05, the third year \$8,516.91. On the 13th day of March, 1883, Rev. J. P. More and wife were chosen to labor in the same field. In 1884 Rev. William E. Hoy was chosen as another worker. On the 21st of April, 1885, the Board elected two lady missionaries, Miss Lizzie R. Poorbaugh and Miss Mary B. Ault; but owing to a want of funds, they did not sail for Japan until June, 1886. The wisdom of this latter movement was exemplified in the increased interest among the women of the Church. The Board had expressed the hope in its first triennial report, several years before, "that the women of the Reformed Church will soon come to the aid of the good cause, and as a sex endeavor to assist in rescuing the women of Japan from their heathen degradation." The sending of some of our sisters stirred the hearts of the women. And if our brethren can get away from some of the fossilized ideas of the centuries that are gone and get into the nineteenth century, and give three-fourths of the consecrated energy of our Church a chance, the most extravagant expectations from woman's aid will be more than realized.

The Church stood with bated breath at the work already done, and the boundless waste of heathenism and idolatry that opened up before it. Paul's Macedonian cry had become a mighty tempest of wail and woe, bidding us come over and help. The Board, with some misgiving, but in faith, agreed to send out another missionary family. The laborers in that white harvest field were fainting under the burden of the sheaves that were being gathered. The harvest grew in whiteness and readiness for the sickle. At a meeting of the Board, held July 6, 1887, arrangements were made to send out Rev. D. B. Schneder and wife. In 1891, after the Woman's Missionary Society stepped forward and assumed the support of an additional lady missionary, the way was opened for sending out Miss Mary Hallowell, of Chambersburg. Let this heroic

undertaking of the women of the Reformed Church stand as a testimony to their pluck and courage when the crisis comes. In 1892, Rev. H. K. Miller was commissioned and sent forward to this outpost, so ably manned and womaned thus far, and crowned with such eminent success. When he was sent the funds were not at hand, but some heavenly instinct prompted the Board to appeal to the Sunday-schools. The amount needed was forthcoming speedily. The first triennial report of the Treasurer shows receipts amounting to \$16,000; the second, \$17,000; the third, \$25,000; the fourth, \$42,000; the fifth, \$61,000.

Timid spirits sometimes fear that the Board has allowed its feelings to run away with its judgment. The Church holds its breath when the Board asks for \$90,000 during the next three years. Be it said reverently, in the face of all the facts, that men under but a faint inspiration of that Almighty Christ, whose right it is to rule all and have all, could not have done otherwise. To halt now would be to fly in the face of providential facts which are as plainly marked before us as the passage through the Jordan before the Israelites, who stood on the other side. To linger now would be disloyalty to our Captain who has gone before us. To hesitate to lay upon the altar these reasonable amounts required at our hands will be to go back to the spirit of the times when the Reformed Church had neither mission nor missionary. A calm, dispassionate Christian contemplation of all the successes and failures, the encouragements and difficulties, compels us to go forward. To falter is disloyalty to Christ. To insist that we cannot raise the funds needed for our foreign work will be to incur the sin of Ananias and Sapphira. The work, however, will not be accomplished by a folding of the hands to sleep, but by apostolic courage and daring.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF MINISTERS AND THE
WIDOWS OF DECEASED MINISTERS.

This is the oldest charitable institution of the Reformed

Church in this country. It was organized about the year 1792, but was not incorporated till the 26th day of March, 1810. In 1755, under the fostering care of the mother church of Holland, there was a fund raised for the support of the widows of deceased Reformed ministers. In this early time, considerable sums were raised and forwarded to those who had come out as helpmeets to the ministers who had brought the gospel to the poor Germans, driven out by the cruel persecutors who desolated the home of our blessed Reformed Church in the Fatherland. During the Revolutionary struggle moneys were sent over for this purpose in sums ranging from \$57 to \$228 at a time. In 1793, when the Reformed Church in the United States attained its majority, and began to stand upon its own privileges and prerogatives, the Synod organized a Society for the Relief of Disabled Ministers and the Widows of Deceased Ministers. Though these early benefactions were very limited, yet oftentimes the wolf was kept from the door while the old disciple, no longer able to buckle on the armor, watched the conflict from afar, while he waited for the bliss of dying in Christ. On the 10th day of March, 1810, a charter was granted by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The charter officers of the society were John Henry Helfrich, President; Philip Pauli, Vice-President; Samuel Helfenstein, Secretary; George Geistweit, Assessor; William Hendel, Treasurer. The earlier efforts of the society seem to have been expended in caring for the faithful widows that had cast in their lot with the sainted heroes who traveled far and wide, in trackless forests, to break the bread of life to the scattered children of the King. It was chartered under the style and title of the Society of Guardians for the Relief of the Widows of the German Reformed Clergymen. These men did not seem to think it was necessary to provide for a day when they could no longer preach the gospel. Their principle was to wear out, not to rust out. Being chartered as an institution entirely within the bounds of Pennsylvania, and with but a limited extent of usefulness, it nearly died out. In 1832 the membership was reduced to only

four. The matter was brought to the attention of the Synod at Frederick, that same year. These faithful men requested the appointment of a committee who should confer with them as to the proper distribution of the funds in their hands. Nothing was done till the Synodical meeting at Easton, during the following year, when a committee was appointed to confer with the incorporators, and request them to transfer the funds in their hands to the Theological Seminary, then located at York, Pa. A meeting of the committee and the incorporators was held, and after much earnest discussion it was decided to refer the whole matter to the next meeting of the Synod, to be held at Pittsburg, in 1834. At this meeting it was decided to continue the society, and a committee was appointed, of which the Rev. B. C. Wolf was Chairman, to carry out the wishes of the Synod.

In 1835, when the Synod met at Chambersburg, there seems to have been a new life infused into the society. Many of the ministers became life or contributing members, by paying the amount prescribed by the charter. A new charter was drafted, and by the incorporators thought to have been properly passed by the regularly constituted authorities. The apparent revival did not continue very long. There was a heavy falling from grace. In 1849, when all the other benevolent operations of the Church were entering upon a new life, this society also felt the thrill of benevolence which was shaking the whole Church. The members of the society did not yet realize that they were working under the old charter. Finally, in 1865, an appendix was added to the old charter, which enabled the society to widen the sphere of its influence and enlarge the amount of money that it was allowed to hold. The progress of the society in the last twenty-seven years has been marked; but the most rapid strides have been made within the last few years. A few faithful servants, like Drs. W. M. Deatrick and E. V. Gerhart, Revs. T. F. Hoffmeier and S. S. Miller, have ding-donged away at the Church till it has at last thrown off its drowsiness and discovered that its first-born has been cold and naked, and by kind

resolutions it has said, "Be ye warmed and fed," but has not provided the wood for the fire and the wool for the clothing. The last General Synod, so far as I can see, was the first to recognize the society and put it before the Church as worthy of the same confidence and benevolent consideration as Home or Foreign Missions, or any other charity that challenges us to bring tithes and offerings into the store-house of the Lord. After seventy-two years, the invested funds of the society amounted to the paltry sum of \$5,000. The old war-horses were turned out to die upon the arid common, dependent upon the cold charities of the world. When the Government began to take such good care of the soldiers who had lost their health in the awful struggle of '61 and succeeding years, as well as the widows of those who had poured out their life's blood in the struggle, a sense of shame began to creep over the Church. Shall the nation deal more kindly with its defenders than the Church? Shall their generosity outstrip those who are commanded to do good unto all men, especially unto those who are of the household of faith? An awakened conscience answered, "No! never!" It had about it a ring of positiveness and determination which did not entirely fall upon callous consciences. That there has been some new spirit put into the Church as to its responsibility toward those who have given up their all for it, is evidenced by the increased contributions. During the last seven years there have been received from all sources \$41,654.18. The society has to-day about \$30,000 invested, from which an annual interest is collected. There are two score and ten persons receiving aid from the society, in such sums as the state of the treasury will warrant, and as the needs of the individuals demand. During the last year there was received, through collections from the whole Church, \$5,275.41; from miscellaneous sources, \$555.41; from interest on investments, \$5,712; from donations, \$2,266; making a grand total of \$13,809.69. It is enough to make some of us older brethren sing the Long Meter Doxology to think that the Church has waked up at last to the righteous duty of providing for those who have grown so old in

the service of the Church that they cannot labor any more, and when another girds them, and yet are too young for the everlasting courts of glory. The reports of the officers are healthy and hopeful. There is an awakened interest among ministers and people. If giving a cup of cold water in the name of a prophet shall bring down a prophet's reward, how much more when a prophet is sheltered and clothed and fed? One of the most earnest and devoted friends of the society says, in a private letter: "In the good providence of God I am thankful that this oldest charitable institution, coming down to us from the past, once almost wrecked, is now in a good, solid condition, with the brightest hope before it, if the Church will foster it and care for it as it deserves." A Church that will not provide for its own, when they have laid out all their strength in its interests, is worse than an infidel. Remember them who have labored well for you, and see that the mellowing light of an unobtrusive charity like this shall come in to sweeten the waiting hours when the fiery chariot seems to delay in its coming.

There has been no sphere of our benevolent work which has been undertaken so much in faith as our care of the orphans. The fatherless have not been forgotten. Our Church has felt it its bounden duty and pleasure to see that those who belong to God shall not want any good thing. Among the founders of these homes have been men that exemplified the same intense faith as George Müller, Philip Wichern or Pastor Fliedner. When the romance of the charities of the new world shall be written, the names of Boehringer, Gantenbein, Heisler and Albright will find a place side by side with Passavant and others whose names fill a wide space in the benevolent horizon of the century.

Bethany Orphans' Home was started in a very humble way in 1863 by a now sainted minister of the Reformed Church. Although very poor himself, but with a faith that can remove mountains, he took an orphan into his own family. The number began to increase, and friends came from the most unexpected quarters. A property was secured at Bridesburg, Pa.,

which, under the faithful direction of noble Christian heroes, served as a home till 1867. Although the home was started here without a single dollar, yet in 1881, the home in the meantime having been removed to Womelsdorf, the president of the Board of Managers could report that \$45,000 had been raised, besides what had been contributed toward current expenses. The property was then free of debt. When theological controversy had 'destroyed our unity on every other form of benevolence, the orphans' homes still bound us together. The appeal of cold and hungry children who had been given to God in holy baptism by sainted parents who had loved the Reformed Church unto the death, was always distinctly heard, amid the crash of theological battle. This was oil on the troubled waters. Here the brethren could see eye to eye. Enthusiasm here did not provoke a scintillation of suspicion or jealousy. Here our religion was pure and undefiled.

On the night of Nov. 11, 1882, the Bethany Orphans' Home went up in smoke and blinding flame. In all the history of the century there has not been a heartier response than to the appeal then made to the Church. While the smoke was still smouldering in the ruins, by telegraph and letter there came promises of help. The heart of the Church was stirred, and there was an outpouring of benevolence such as the camp of Israel experienced when the great leader requested funds for the construction of the tabernacle. Fifteen thousand dollars, in addition to the expenses incurred in running the home, was raised in the space of two years. There have been times when this stream of benevolence became a little sluggish; but the rapid flow has soon been enjoyed again. Eighteen thousand dollars has been expended on Santee Hall. The present superintendent, though a David in stature, yet a Saul in faith, says, "We had but very little money to begin this enterprise, but the whole amount was fully paid within six months after the building was occupied by the orphans." The home has now one hundred and six orphans, and the expenses have been thus far promptly met. The Christmas receipts for the current ex-

penses last year were \$5,000, the largest contribution from the same source in the history of the home. The president of the Board of Managers, speaking of a needed investment, requiring thousands of dollars, says: "The Board bought this property as an act of faith, without having one hundred dollars towards its payment. The Father of the fatherless raised up friends among the living and the dying to pay for it. Thus far its history has revealed a series of marvellous providences. Hitherto the Lord hath helped us, and we trust Him for the future." The history of the Orphans' Home at Butler, Pa., presents a like glow of benevolence. The Christian sympathy of the Reformed Church of the western portion of the old Keystone State and of the Buckeye State, has flowed into the treasury of the Lord for the care of the orphans with all the copiousness of one of their prosperous oil wells. In 1867 St. Paul's Orphans' Home was established by St. Paul's Classis, but it was not chartered by the State till 1888. It is now under the control of the Pittsburgh Synod. One of the reports says, "It was founded in faith and has been successfully carried forward under the blessing of God." During the three years preceding the meeting of the General Synod at Lebanon, in 1890, the sum of \$47,500 had been expended. The Church contributes annually about \$2,000 towards the support of the sixty-five orphans in the home. There have been as high as 180 orphans in the home at one time, and yet there was room. The property of the home now is valued at \$50,000, upon which there is an indebtedness of \$10,000; but a report of the Board says provisions are being made to pay this off gradually. Nearly five hundred orphans have been sheltered, clothed and educated in the home since its establishment.

For quite a long while there was felt a need of wider efforts to provide for the fatherless children. It was a vain thing to pray that God would provide for the fatherless children, when a trifle of our extravagance would clothe and feed all the poor and hungry within our borders with a bountiful supply of toothsome fragments for those who are homeless in more senses than one.

With but a little moral support and encouragement from the General Synod, the German Synod of the Northwest and the Central Synod started another Orphans' Home in Fort Wayne, Ind. In 1883 this new charity sprang into existence, when the same faith that prompted Bethany and St. Paul's, and carried them forward with such eminent success, was found to be stirring west of the Ohio River. The faith of our Reformed brethren did not chill when it climbed over the Alleghenies. However exalted into the chilling altitudes through which it passed, it came down to the homely task of Christian duty, and in the face of all the mad rush of western progress, gathered together the children who were crying for bread, and, above all, for the Bread of everlasting life. A farm was at once purchased for \$7,000. Before the most enthusiastic promoters of this child of the West had time to recover their breath, in 1884 a house was erected at a cost of \$10,000. Seven years afterwards an addition was needed, and it was pushed to completion at once, at a cost of \$8,000. More land was purchased and broader foundations were laid. The property on hand to-day is worth between \$50,000 and \$60,000. The total expenditures to date have been \$103,344.65. The liabilities are only \$10,000. There have been 114 orphans in the Home, and there are to-day 57 children under its friendly shelter. Well may the treasurer of the Board exclaim with a just pride,—Come and see. Before such a magnificent display of Christian munificence, we may excuse an occasional anxiety, lest the General Synod may not acknowledge the self-supporting spirit of the Germans and impose upon them a rather more than fair share of the financial burdens of the Synod. Sheboygan among the literary institutions, and Fort Wayne among the orphans' homes, prove what German faith can do when once put to the task. There is everywhere in our orphans' homes an enlargement of operations, wider influence, more efficient administration and a multiplicity of endeavors that show a predominating influence of that faith which turned the world upside down, and is a standing answer to that supercilious confidence with

which old and dead unbeliefs, after their attempted revivification are paraded by the unsanctified wit and wisdom of these later centuries.

Standing, then, upon the threshold of another century, we may well look at the favorable winds filling our sails, as we commit ourselves to the seething, surging life of the twentieth century. Shall we, dare we stand timidly upon the shore and be contented to watch the heroic sailors, under other banners, committing their missionary barks to the flowing tide, fairly dancing with divine-human possibilities? Need we timidly face the open doors of golden promise, which have been suddenly swung back by some of the most favoring gales of heaven inviting us to enter in? Need our spiritual children cry for bread, and we give them a stone or shut our ears to their pleadings? Nay, verily, we cannot recover the ground that has been lost, but by the blessing of God we can prevent the historian of the second century of our benevolent work from charging us with indifference, and compel him to award us some meed of praise in helping onward that grand triumph of Christianity, which is certainly lingering about our doors.

We have now a settled policy. Anarchy and confusion have given way to common sense, instinct with spiritual power, born from above. Scattered energies have coalesced, and the tidal wave of peace is leveling barriers which hitherto prevented a real trial of our strength. Our hosts are gathered together. Our scattered talents are being gathered into our treasury, and the result is encouraging. The policy of the Church is to carry forward its work, under the management of Boards, with a cosmopolitan spirit, generous enough to provide with Christian care for all parts of the Church. The General Synod's requests are generally respected, and the Church everywhere feels that we are united in our benevolent work. There is an occasional squirm that shows the slimy folds of an obstreperous eel, that cannot be held within proper bounds. But the great heart of the Church to-day beats in a unison that augurs well for a consummate effort to fulfill the duties that devolve upon us before God and

man. Then, again, we are beginning to realize that we can do something worthy of the generous benevolence that has characterized other denominations. We need not wonder that our church is not known. It is a mortification that but few speakers, when referring on a public platform to church work, mention our Reformed Zion. Our benevolent work has not been significant enough to make itself felt. But that reproach is beginning to roll away from us. The mist may linger still for awhile upon the loftiest mountain tops; but we are going up into our inheritance and the mist must roll away. The faith of the different Boards in undertaking larger fields will not be in vain. The Church has begun to realize that it can and must do great things for God. It has inscribed upon its banner—Expect great things from God and do great things for God! It stands before big trees crowned with golden fruitage, and it is bound to pluck it, though it requires courage and daring of a godly sort. We are finding out that we can endow colleges and seminaries, we can send missionaries into vacant fields, we can rely upon the Church to contribute moneys for honest efforts to hasten the millennial dawning. We can, according to our numbers, wealth and intelligence, accomplish as grand results as other churches which have assumed much more marked proportions. May the time be at hand when no public orator, when enumerating the churches doing a noble work for Christ, dare to omit the Reformed Church in the United States!

We are awakening to a sense of the responsibility that we have a mission. Our eyes have been too long upon the past. We have been living upon the theological triumphs of a half century ago. It has been regarded as our special province to be the watch dog of the ecclesiastical treasury, so that no false theological coin might get into circulation. But this kind of business would never bring the world to the pierced feet of the triumphant Saviour. We have criminally left the conversion of the cities, which are to-day the controlling centres of influence, thought and life, to the generous impulses of others. We have been so busy with theological speculation that we have forgotten

that we, with all the Israel of God, are to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. This is now all being changed. Theory is being put into practice, our architectonic theology is coming out of the school and the seminary, and is touching the hurrying world that is lying all around us. Our ministers and people are coming into touch more and more with the intensely practical problems which have turned the closing years of this century into a huge interrogation point. Upward and onward, and outward, and skyward, and seaward, our banner floats. And with the unfurling of its gracious folds, a thankful people hurry into the conflict, ready to wipe out the foul assumption that there is a single place or people, where we cannot work for Christ, or that there is a problem propounded by any class in any condition to which we cannot give a reasonable answer. If all these promises fail, and these prophecies become as the sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, then the spirit of Zwingli and Calvin is dead, and their spiritual followers are bastards and not sons. In a country that boasts of a Bunker Hill, a Valley Forge, a Yorktown, but above all of a Gettysburg, where heroism sanctified every foot of ground over which the blue and gray met in mortal combat, I cannot believe that the Church of the Martyrs, the Church of Cappel, the Church of the Hollanders, who would drown their land beneath the sea rather than allow it to fall into the hands of the alien, the Church of the Huguenots, which defied an empire rather than cast a pinch of incense into the flame of a papal censor, is not brave enough to do and to dare for that Christ, whom it theologically so royally honora.

VII.

THE TRUE AIM OF IDEAL EDUCATION.

BY REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

ASIDE from her deep interest in the propagation of the Gospel through missionary effort, and her zealous endeavor to bring about the reunion of a divided Christendom, the American Church of our day shows no signs of life more hopefully vigorous than those of her educational activity. This gratifying activity, intense and widely distributed, is due largely to a better appreciation of the meaning of true education, and a more earnest purpose to furnish succeeding generations better facilities for meeting the design of life. In part, however, it is due also to a measure of needed protection,—protection against errors, which, like insidious diseases, are eating into the very vitals of our civilization, and threatening to lower the standard of our manhood.

The large degree of outward prosperity which has attended the labors of our people has brought with it some of these errors, and greatly stimulated the inveterate vitality of others. The opportunities afforded by the present day, and especially by our country, for material progress and speedy wealth, have never before been so numerous and alluring. Under their influence, it is felt, far too many are constantly led to worship the *means*, and to forget the *ends* of life. In the matter of education, this influence is seen in the urgency with which is pressed the abridgement of the period allotted to its acquisition, so that youngest years possible may be given to the rush and bustle accompanying the pursuits and duties of active modern life. This makes the rapidly increasing area of the field of

knowledge and the old and well-tried curriculum of collegiate studies,—at once eminently interesting and attractive to minds appreciating their significance and value,—repellent often to those who stand in greatest need of attempting the survey of the one, and the mastery of the other. It makes popular also the “short-cut” courses of training “specialists”—courses whose studies are chosen, not with a view of furthering the ends of true education, but for so-called “practical” purposes. They promise speedy material returns, and, accordingly, have a strong tendency to entice the unwary into their dwarfing, and therefore, to right-thinking people, forbidding paths.

Conscious of the dangerous trend of these and similar errors, and concerned about the welfare of our future citizens, the Church has done well in arousing herself to greater assiduity in the prosecution of the educational work so largely entrusted to her. Only at the expense of her innocence before the Master could she have purchased exemption from the responsibility of performing this duty. “When by cold penury,” Burke says in one of his polished dissertations, “I blast the abilities of a nation, and stunt the growth of its active energies, the ill I may do is beyond all calculation.” Should the Church allow the cold materialism of external prosperity, or the colder utilitarianism of false educational theories to prevail, the mental abilities of our people would be blasted, their moral and spiritual energies would be stunted, and the resultant ill would likewise be beyond the power of human calculation.

Now, when saying this, it should be remembered that the Church never ceases to bless God for having made possible to our people the achievement of such splendid results in the way of mechanical and material progress; that she contemplates with profound gratitude the noble work done by “specialists” in the various scientific and industrial walks of life; and that she heartily commends diligence and thrift in the management of the public and private affairs in which our people are interested. Her contention is not against material prosperity, devotion to special work, or the acquisition of competence or

fortune; but against the making of these the all-inclusive, the all-absorbing business and purpose of earthly existence. She should deplore to an extent beyond the power of language to express, to see a still larger proportion of our citizens under the power of false notions concerning the ends of life, and the aims of education, carried away into the wretched and lamentable onesidedness of character, which alas! is already too common. What a nation we should be if all were "specialists," having their lives narrowed down to the thinking and doing of some particular thing, or if all were worshipers simply of cities and railways, of manufacture and commerce, of scientific discovery and invention, of banks and bonds! The poet who insists that—

"By the soul

Only, the nations shall be great and free,"

teaches an eternal truth, and believing the truth taught, should not feelings of patriotism,—not to mention higher motives, which, at least, parents and pastors must know,—constrain men everywhere to applaud the Church's desire to rear increasing multitudes of men known and glorying to be known for their souls,—men whose pride is not outward possession or moneyed power, but in well-rounded, thoroughly-furnished, divinely-inspired manhood; men who think, if not less about things transitory and perishable, certainly more about having their divinely-given capacities, faculties and powers so filled and cultivated, so under rational self-control and in subjection to God, as to make the men themselves what image-bearers of the Deity should be, nay, must be, if their mission here is to be accomplished, their destiny hereafter attained. Towards the realization of this desire there is nothing, it is confidently believed, that can make so large and lasting a contribution, as the establishing of the true aim in the pursuit of ideal education. Hence the new and fervid zeal with which this cause is everywhere being pressed upon the attention of those who can give assistance in advancing the work begun, to its proper goal.

What this true aim of ideal education is, has been often

asked? It has been frequently answered, also by the wisest and best of the world's teachers. These answers might be gathered, with some interest and profit no doubt, but they would hardly be accepted as a satisfying reply by those who in our times are anew making inquiry. Just as progress in theological thought from age to age demands the restatement of the doctrines of the Christian faith, so in the realm of education are there constantly recurring necessities for the restatement of what may be called educational doctrines,—for the setting forth in present-day terms of the aim toward which the activities of a true educational policy should be directed.

The limits to which the restatement now attempted must be confined allow the consideration of only the two main factors ever to be insisted upon, as entering into a true educational aim. The one of these we have learned to designate by the word *liberal*. The term is trite, I know, and hard-worn by the constant service it has been made to render. But it has never yet ceased to represent a necessity that is signally vital and important in the theory and practice of ideal educational work.

According to the definition given by the most generally quoted of our lexicographers, an education is liberal if the studies which go to constitute it are "extended beyond the practical necessities of life." It is plain, of course, that a liberal education must include more than the elementary branches pertaining to practical necessities,—and that is a truth not unworthy of notice under this view. But it is evident also that many a one, having had the advantage of such instruction, is not by reason of that fact merely, entitled to be called a liberally-educated individual. In other phrase, it is not the acquisition of facts simply from an extensive field of knowledge, that means liberal training. Much of the popular practice in schools goes upon the principle that impartation of knowledge is the primary end to be reached by them. Such schools, says a German writer, "do not educate, they only teach; do not train, they only instruct." And Herr Wilhelm Balsche, the Berlin critic, in a recently published paper, indig-

nantly observes that, "such crude methods are followed only by 'untaught teachers,' whose cramming, torturing tactics tend to make martyrs" of their pupils, rather than rightly-trained and broadly-cultivated men. The free and full development of many of the mental faculties is repressed by this practice, and the result is almost directly contrary to that essayed by the true system of generous culture.

This is felt by those who apply the word liberal to the effect produced upon the several faculties and energies of the mind, rather than to an extensive range of study, by the use of which their discipline is sought. The conception of education held by them is obtained from the suggestions of its etymological meaning. For them the true aim of education is "the educating or drawing forth of all that is potentially in man; the training of all the energies and capacities of his being to the highest pitch, and the directing of them to their true ends." Their favorite type of this process is that of the sculptor, by which he brings the statue out of the rude block of marble. The tools needed to educe the beautiful form of symmetrical manhood are the arts and sciences, the histories and philosophies of past generations. These, brought into contact with the powers and faculties potentially present in the persons to be educated, draw out the same from their native weakness and imperfections into the strength and beauty and individuality which are to be their own. Under the liberalizing power of the educative touch of a sufficiently wide range of study the mind, as a whole, is given the power for which it is intended. The man is enabled to think for himself, and accordingly to form judgments and to perform actions with the utmost efficiency.

It will be seen at once that in this latter view there is more commending it to our approbation than in the former. The acquisition of thoroughly-trained mental faculties is something more and better by a great deal than the possession merely of vast stores of knowledge, even though that knowledge be gathered from the broad fields of language and mathematics, of history and biography, of natural science and art, of philosophy

and theology. To be qualified by educational training to think for one's self is a long step in the direction of the liberalization of a man's entire being, of his deliverance from the darkness and the ills to be encountered in life by him. Among the many wise reflections in "*Sartor Resartus*" none is wiser than that which offers itself as not inappropriate here: "Truly a thinking man is the worst enemy the prince of darkness can have; every time such a one announces himself, I doubt not there runs a shudder through the nether empire; and new emissaries are trained with new tactics to, if possible, entrap him." Under any theory, or in any system of education, the achievement of such results, as thinking men, would go far toward justifying its aim and methods as worthy of wide adoption.

The full purpose and highest aim of liberal culture should not be realized, however, by the making of this view the one to be exclusively accepted and universally followed. There is something nobler and better, something worthier of human aspiration, in the theory which rightfully claims that "the grand design of education—certainly of liberal education—is to educe or draw us out of our native individualism into the common humanity, and that the most thoroughly educated—be their knowledge more or less—are those who have experienced the most of that humanizing process through which our views are continually more and more directed to that destiny and that knowledge which pertain to man as man, in distinction from that which concerns him in his individual, partial, and professional relations." Those who will pause to reflect upon the lofty ideal held up to our view by this theory, must soon discover that it is not a mere dream, but a very real and nobly worthy aim that is thus proposed for educational guidance. If in all our effort in the direction of human training its suggestions were truly followed, the intellect, it will be observed, would be informed, the sensibilities cultivated, the will given righteous direction—conserving in this way all that is aimed at by either or both of the other theories—and in addition there would result immeasurably more. Our individual and national

life would soon rejoice under the benediction of what has been called "a fuller and more harmonious development of our humanity, greater freedom from narrowness and prejudice, more wealth of thought, more expansive sympathies, feelings more catholic and humane." This means that the centre around which the human universe is accustomed to revolve would be changed. The individual would find that the loss involved in projecting itself into the broad current of the common life of humanity meant in the end its greatest possible gain. Its highest, its noblest, its best self would thus be realized. From an educational point of view, even as from a moral and religious, it is true that "whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it."

At this point, however, the other factor to be noticed as entering into the true aim of ideal education is met with, and may be designated by the word *Christian*. The loftiest aim which has been suggested by philosophic speculation to guide education finds itself in this position, namely—its truthfulness remains unchallenged, yet of itself it has neither the motive nor power to give, by which men can realize what it points out to them. In other words, the theory involves more than can be supplied by any system, or institution, or teacher, apart from Christ and Christianity. So long as men fail to recognize this truth, or fail to introduce the Christian element into the aim of their educational efforts, so long must they fail also of attaining to the loftiest ideal that can govern men seeking generous culture for the individual in the interests of the race. Those who are Christ's disciples—learners of Him under a system that makes real account of the Christian factor in its aim—"shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free;" and those made free by Him who is the Truth "shall be free indeed." Any system doing less, in the way of liberalizing effect upon human life, than that which is implied in the freedom promised in these words of the great Teacher from heaven, comes so far short of helping aspiring men on towards the attainment of the destiny appointed for them.

What Thomas Arnold, during his days of earnest Christian effort at Rugby, said of his age and country, is equally true of our own: "Christianity has so colored all our institutions and all our literature, and has in so many points modified or even dictated our laws, that no one can be considered an educated man who is not acquainted with its authoritative documents;" and, it may be added, no one can be in touch with, or in the broad spirit of the highest and freest relations, purposes and privileges of life, who is not in vital fellowship with the Person in whom those documents centre, and without whom they have no meaning. What is to be aimed at, therefore, according to the ideal which the Church is endeavoring to emphasize in her educational activity, is not simply liberal culture, but liberal culture that is vitally Christian. The aim of education which bears this stamp, finds its motive and end not in abstract information, not in intellectual powers which are well equipped for practical ends, but in the totality of man's being lifted and ennobled under the inspiring influence of Truth incarnate—Truth grounded in a Person, vindicated in a Life.

Fancy fails of power adequately to depict the stupendous and hallowing transformation to be wrought by the general adoption of this true aim of ideal education in homes, in colleges and universities the land over! The errors alluded to as existing in our land and threatening our nobler life, will then not have long to wait for correction. The heavy burdens and ills under which so many are groaning, will then soon be removed. The unblushing iniquities now stalking about in the pride of conscious power will then speedily be destroyed. The perplexing social and economic problems, now clamoring for solution, will at once be solved. Men everywhere in their individual and social relations will be truly educated, and answer more nearly than now to the intellectual, moral and spiritual perfection of men full-grown "according to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

VIII.

COLLEGE-NEED AND COLLEGE-NEEDS; AN APPEAL.

BY R. C. SCHIEDT.

WE are passing through a serious educational crisis at the present time. The heterogeneity of our national life has produced such a differentiation of purpose and multiplicity of opinions in matters educational that it seems utterly impossible to judge of the final outcome. This is especially true of our higher institutions of learning. The universities have entered upon their formative period; they are, if the comparison is allowed, half chrysalis and half image, still clinging to the curriculum of the traditional college, and yet step by step breaking away from its former inflexible limitations. History repeats itself: about two hundred years ago we find a similar crisis in the development of European universities. Here, however, the reverse took place, namely, a differentiation from the higher to the lower, *i.e.*, from the university to the preparatory college. But we must consider that the *universitas* of the continent as well as the *collegium* of England at first merely represented corporations; in the former case a combination of different nationalities or a *universitas personarum*, in the latter a body of colleagues. These corporations either confined themselves to the promotion of only one branch of learning, Salerno to medicine, Bologna to law, or to more than one; so Paris at first to philosophy and theology, the former including the trivium and quadrivium, afterwards, however, expanding into the faculties of the arts, philosophy, law and medicine. The faculty, or as it was first called, the university of the arts, was by far the most extensive

and influential, admitting boys at the age of twelve with a preparation not exceeding that of a common school, and keeping them until they had obtained the master's degree. At this stage of the development the university resembles somewhat the new American universities, with the exception that the latter claim to be a *universitas literaria* rather than a *universitas personarum*. The establishment of the lyceum in France, the gymnasium in Germany, and the grammar school in England, was an outgrowth of the department of arts in the universities. With the advancement of knowledge in the various spheres, especially under the influence of the revival of classic literature, a more thorough preparation became necessary for the entrance into the university, and the classic preparatory schools gradually multiplied as separate institutions. In the United States the universities are an outgrowth of the colleges, and it is but natural for them to retain, for the present, the original college curriculum as a part of their organization. But, as in the history of the European universities, the preparatory college had to become a distinct intermediate institution between the common school and the highest seats of learning; so must we also expect in the course of time, in this country, the complete separation of the pure college which carries on education for its own sake from the university. Each State will have at most two universities, in the sense of schools for specialists, with a large number of colleges scattered throughout the commonwealth whose sole purpose it will be to prepare young men for the various callings in life. It may be said, however, that different conditions naturally result in different developments, and that the increase in population requires an equivalent increase of universities. My reply is that, as far as the first objection is concerned, the central educational principle i.e., the education of all of man's powers must always and under all conditions remain the same, and that if it is curtailed by a half college and half university curriculum, the welfare of society in general must suffer; in reference to the second objection, we must maintain that at least for the next century the increase in population will not be so enor-

mous as to require a large number of such universities in each State. One change, however, must be the inevitable consequence. Just as the university will have to concede some of its present work to the college, so the college will have to enter upon a much closer relationship to the academies or preparatory schools, because its success will depend upon the degree of preparation with which a young man or woman enters college. Denominational colleges will then become, to a large degree, what the University of Paris was at its beginning, comprising a department of arts, with preparatory branches, and perhaps a department of theology. The great question which is at present agitating the minds of all parties interested is, What shall be the proper domain of such a college?

Some of the most prominent educators maintain that the study of the natural sciences should be pre-eminent in a college curriculum, because this is pre-eminently a scientific age; others of equal authority emphasize exclusive classic culture as the royal road to the highest development of human personality. But in all discussions on the subject the unbiased observer unconsciously receives the impressions that personal preferences, grown out of the particular work of each man, guide the decisions; partisan spirit is the curse of all true progress. The final solution of this question can hardly be reached in our generation, and under our peculiar political and social circumstances all we can do is to concentrate all our powers upon the particular task given to us and to discuss this burning question with as much impartiality as possible.

When I ask the friends of Franklin and Marshall College to aid its scientific department in a more liberal way than has been done hitherto, they may justly demand an explanation of the requirements to which such an institution of learning may lay claim. In the introduction to this article I have endeavored to point out the position which our oldest institution of learning can reasonably be expected to hold for the next fifty years, i. e., not that of a university, but that of a college in the true sense of the word. It is, therefore, of *college-need and college-needs* that I shall treat in the following discussion.

The two principles which deserve pre-eminent consideration in any system of preparatory education are the *subjective or linguistic* and the *objective or mathematico-scientific*. Language is the organ by which the character and spirit of a nation are manifested. Through the use of language the individual becomes a part of his nation; he becomes ingrafted into his nation's life. Language resembles the nervous system, which not only binds the individual organs together, but which subordinates all and each to the whole body, and that is only possible when every organ is surrounded by nerves. In language the ideal element of the people becomes real; it combines the abstract with the concrete, the spiritual with the historical. In it and by means of it all thoughts and aspirations of a nation are expressed and gathered up in order that all the individual members of the nation may freely partake of them. The child becomes a part of its nation by learning to speak its language in daily personal intercourse. National life thus permeates individual life. But whilst the child gains only concepts which relate mainly to the universal habits of daily social intercourse, of eating and drinking, of making and spending money; the student in a much higher sense, by coming in contact with the great writers of a people, enters into a relation to the great intellects who profoundly influence the development of humanity. The loftiest sentiments of a nation embodied in its great geniuses lift him up to purer and nobler views and more exalted principles, and mould his whole personality. Thus the student becomes inspired to penetrate towards brighter heights of knowledge and to struggle against the impulses coming from below, against the crude and blunt in his habits, against the immoral and licentious in his actions and words. He becomes master of his spiritual powers, more and more sensitive to the noble and beautiful in the writings of his nation, and at the same time capable of expressing his own thoughts and ideas in an acceptable form. Linguistic studies naturally bring a young man into right relation to his nation as a whole; he becomes an integral part of it. Thus it becomes clear to us why the educa-

tion of men and the study of languages have always been identified, why at a time when modern languages were yet in their infancy the study of classic languages constituted the only means of educating and ennobling humanity.

It therefore matters not how much a man may forget in after years, since we do not seek after quantitative knowledge, but after a qualitative principle. If we would have to retain all we once learned, we would be the most miserable creatures in the universe. Behold the queen of the forest, the proud cedar, lifting its crown majestically towards the clouds! Has it never produced branches near its roots? Certainly; it simply cast them off when they became superfluous; but its trunk and its crown, its whole proud stature still announces the work of its youth. In its crown are its roots. So has many a man who belonged to the greatness of his age forgotten what he once had learned; nevertheless unconsciously it became a part of himself, and thus he acquired his greatness.

But all linguistic education has one great defect which needs correction. It grows out of the fact that language, and all that is expressed especially by language, start in man. Language is almost exclusively subjective. A word which signifies an object does not interpret the nature of the object in itself, but only the impression which the object makes upon man. The word gold does not express any of the physical properties of that metal, but simply relates to something glittering. The same is true of all words relating to the sensuous, to magnitudes, judgments or similar concepts. What is large? What is small? What is fair? What is warm? What is beautiful? What is rich? What is fast? What is slow? The answers to these questions will be as different as the persons who give them. Those animals are called cold-blooded whose blood is a few degrees below the temperature of the blood of man. Small is that which, measured by the yard, foot or inch, makes such an impression upon man's mind. We may mention in this connection those expressions and idioms which have come down to us from former centuries and have gained such a foot-hold that they are still used, though it has

been proven long ago that they convey an entirely wrong meaning; *e. g.*, the rising and setting of the sun, the Orient and Occident, the celestial globe, our conception of the stars as stars, in the shape adopted symbolically by decorative art, and many others. And whatever is true of a single word is likewise true of whole sentences and constructions. An historian is expected to write nothing but facts and to base his conclusions upon facts. But read two representations of one and the same event given by two persons who endeavor to tell the truth, and nothing but the truth; how different in detail, how varied in conception and method of presentation will these two narrations be. Any competent judge is capable of distinguishing between Tacitus and Livy, between Xenophon and Thucydides. This goes to show that all linguistic presentation bears the colorite of its author. And not only the syntax discloses the mental peculiarities of the writer, but also the elementary forms, the manner in which nouns and verbs are inflected, clearly show the position of the writer in relation to the object or action or condition which the verb expresses. This phenomenon becomes especially apparent in all those linguistic products in which man is the inventor of the subject matter, and it finds nowhere a fuller expression than in schools of rhetoric and elocution. It is the aim of the art and skill of a true orator to work out the impression which an event makes upon man, and to present this and not the event itself, more especially to give the event his own individual interpretation and to show it to men only as he sees it. Language is admirably adapted to such treatment, for in it is most intimately interwoven the relation which exists between the *évent* and man's conception of it. Every word which is uttered with regard to an event, either sad or joyful, expresses this relation, and of this has been taken advantage in all schools of oratory, both in ancient and in modern times, in the lecture room of the sophists, in the forum, in the pulpit, before juries, but especially, and perhaps in the most effective way, in the assembly halls of legislative bodies. I do not say too much, therefore, when I affirm that in every thing which

is expressed in the form of speech, that even in language itself, in its roots and inflections, in syntax, in all literary works, but especially in all productions of oratory and poetry, the starting point lies in man, and not in the subject matter itself. Observe a child and its mode of expression, and you will find that it refers everything back to itself; hence here originates the loveliness of a child's mind, but likewise its many defects and evils. You will notice that just herein lies the fragrance of the legend, the myth, the fairy story; but you will likewise not fail noticing that here also a rich source of error and fallacy, of perjury and calumny, is to be found. The overdue stress laid upon linguistic studies has resulted in flooding the intellectual market with an army of utterly impracticable men who are incapable of coping with the objective realities of life, who rather starve than seek employment outside of the intellectual sphere. And just here offers itself the most portentous problem of the modern college; namely, the problem to prepare young men in such a way as to not only enable, but encourage them to carry their classic learning out upon the highways of the mechanical arts.

It is therefore necessary that all linguistic instruction must be supplemented. And if there should be such a branch of instruction which has more than relative value which man can neither add to nor take away from, one would think that that would be the best means of education, that which Plato has sought in vain in his discourse on the state, that which should stand foremost in all education. Such a branch is mathematics, theoretical and applied. In language everything is for man and from man; in mathematics everything is without him and in spite of him; everything was before him, before he could perceive and think, and will continue to be even if he should not understand it any more. Here is no contradiction, no correction possible, for its theorems inscribed into and upon the universe, according to which all nature is constructed, are older than man and are universal and necessary truth. It is true, even mathematics does not reveal the thing in itself, the absolute. Kant has proved that we will never know the absolute, "*das Ansichseiende*;" but

whilst language works only through our senses, our feelings, our passions, mathematics knows nothing of these corrupting influences; it treats the ideal in its objectivity.

Language only *speaks* of the correctness of a thing, of a concept, of an affirmation; mathematics on the other hand *shows* us a *reality*, and therefore, awakens the sense for the actual, the real. Whatever has been created by language lives only as long as men live and reaches only as far as men dwell. But whatever is the product of nature, the creative as well as the created, law, beauty, truth and all that which mathematics reveal of her, lives and thrives no matter whether man recognizes it or not, whether man seeks it or not. He can only find it by subordinating and silencing himself, his selfish will, his prejudices and his passions, and by placing himself in the service of that spirit who lives in all creation. Nothing is more important in this age of conflicting parties than to teach young men that truth is not made, but that it is given, independent from the desires and aspirations of parties, something to which man must simply submit.

There is no science better adapted to teach just this fact than applied mathematics. Its formulas may be forgotten and buried in the reminiscences of the past; but one fact will always remain, and that is that amidst all the changes going on around us, within and without us, the spirit which lives and rules in all is the same always, the unchangeable, revealed by exact science. It alone can tell us whether a change taking place in the world is real or only apparent. If it is only apparent, our imperfect observation has to account for it; he who has learned to observe the change which a mathematical formula undergoes when the system of the axis is displaced, will be able to apply his knowledge for the correction of all false impressions which he encounters in the experiences of practical life, be it in his office as a minister of the gospel, or as a lawyer, or as a physician, or as a business man, or in the struggle of political parties. He will then always be able to decide for the best of himself, for the best of his country, for the best of humanity. The absolute sincerity

and absolute truth of the scientific thinker is his greatest and bravest characteristic.

A greater emphasis of this objective principle in education is the *supreme need of the modern college*. It requires a modification of the present curriculum: According to our present arrangement at least twice as much time is devoted to the study of languages as there is to the mathematico-scientific branches; consequently the latter have been regarded as an entirely secondary matter which hardly deserves recognition. It has been argued that the college offers a unique education just because it has a centre. But is such a system which puts the sun in the centre and all other cosmical bodies in the circumference the only possible one? There are perhaps just as many double constellations in the universe as there are simple sun-systems. So the extreme linguistic course is just as wrong as the extreme technical; both are specialistic: in the former case we train philologists, in the latter engineers. The only way to reconstruct our present curriculum lies in the direction of the academy or preparatory school. The development of the memory and the awakening of the powers of observation certainly belong to the beginning of the second decade in a man's life. A boy of sixteen ought to be master of the elements of the great languages of ancient and modern times in order to derive any profit from the reading of their literature in College; in like manner he ought to have mastered the elements of descriptive Botany, Zoology, Physics and Chemistry, in order to comprehend the great principles of objective truth properly belonging to college teaching. I therefore conclude that a preparatory course of at least five years, with from twenty-five to thirty hours' instruction per week must, of necessity become the essential basis of our modern college after it has once been assigned its proper place as an institution of general education, distinct from the university of specialists. So much for the *pre-eminent need of the college*.

In discussing the *specific needs* of the department which I

represent in our own College at Lancaster, it is necessary to reiterate that in the domain of the objective the student is constantly called upon to verify by personal tests the truths taught, to convince himself by the powers of his own observation, that a thing is so and not otherwise. Experiment is the test of all objective principles. I would, therefore, first advocate a four years' course in experimental science, corresponding to the course in the languages, one hour for lectures and at least two hours for laboratory work per week. Almost all young men entering college are children in observation and practical skill, and the great majority of them remain such throughout their college course. The mechanical requirements for entrance into college, so many pages here and so many books there, have affected their minds to such a degree that they are utterly unable to answer a single question which demands the recording of their own independent observations, and the extremely small margin given to the natural sciences in the curriculum does not encourage the development of original thinking. Besides, it is much more pleasing to the inborn desire for personal comfort to sit in our rocking-chair and "get out our lessons" with or without a "pony," than it is to expose our tender nerves to the odors and "dangers" of a laboratory, or our eyes to the strain a microscope requires, or our precious lives to the "monsters," that lurk in forest, stream and sea. And yet, I must confess that the great majority of American students with whom I have come in contact possess more than ordinary ability, and their training seems worthy of a more perfect and thorough method than is offered by a one-sided subjectivism. I firmly believe that the evils of college life are largely the outgrowth of an overdue development of the imagination. In my experience scientific students do much more serious work than classical students, they become more independent and more manly. What we pre-eminently need is men that can think and act for themselves.

But granted that our circumstances or traditions would not allow an enlargement of the scientific department, the equipment in its present form is nevertheless too meagre to carry on

the required work with any degree of success. What we need in order to keep step with our sister colleges is at least a *much larger annual appropriation* than are granted to us now. Instead of two hundred dollars we ought to have five hundred dollars for the biological and chemical laboratories alone, especially since the department is expected to purchase its own reference books. There are, this year, thirty students at work in the chemical laboratory, and forty-two in the biological. Every one who is conversant with laboratory work knows that the annual expenses of an individual cannot be less than seven dollars, not to mention the apparatus used for general purposes. Besides, in biology the professor in charge must spend the greater part of his vacation in collecting and preparing the material to be used during the coming year; in fact he has to prepare all his material a whole year in advance, most of it requiring several months before it is ready for use, a fact which necessitates the constant appeal to the treasurer, even before the beginning of a new scholastic year. And what shall I say of the care of a scientific museum? However much I should like to advocate this necessary institution, I can hardly dare do so because I myself have not yet been able to spend a whole day in its rooms. All I can say is that a special appropriation is needed for the maintenance and enlargement of our collections, without which they will be and remain useless for the college work.

This review is hardly the place for financial appeals; but since I have been asked to present here the needs of my department, I would say to the friends of Franklin and Marshall College, that it is only through their special extra efforts that we can carry on our work even in its present form. We ought to have at once three hundred dollars beyond *this year's* appropriation, not to speak of the requirements of next year. But are such scattered appeals worthy of as old and honored an institution as ours is? Will not one of our wealthy friends, who has the welfare of Franklin and Marshall at heart, help us over the difficulties with an endowment of ten or twenty thousand

dollars? I am well aware that such appeals have become platitudes in America, where all higher education is at the mercy of benevolent impulses; but I am no less convinced of the sincerity of those whose generosity has carried Franklin and Marshall through all the difficulties of the past, and who are ever willing to stand by her in all earnest efforts for her present and future welfare.

The centennial year of the Reformed Church has come to a close; one magnificent centennial gift has been offered upon the altar of her educational efforts; we are proud of the gift and the giver; standing on the threshold of a new century, we appeal for a birthday present that will indicate far greater achievements in the new cycle of another hundred years.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE BOY JESUS AND OTHER SERMONS. By William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Pastor Emeritus of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street, near Broadway. 1893. Price \$1.75.

The late Dr. Philip Schaff used to say that sermons should be heard, not read. This is no doubt true of the sermons which are mostly preached, but it is not true of such sermons as are contained in the volume before us. All these are possessed of a high order of merit, and will amply repay careful reading. Young ministers who would learn the secret of true success in preaching will especially find them deserving of their attention and careful study. It would unquestionably be a great gain to the Church if all the utterances of the pulpit were equally clear, sound and instructive.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Colossians—James. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street, near Broadway. 1893. Price \$1.50.

We have on several occasions heretofore called attention to the general characteristics of this work. It is not necessary, therefore, to state them again. As for the present volume, it is fully equal in merit to any of those that have preceded it. Treating of an important portion of the New Testament Scriptures in a homiletical point of view, its sketches of sermons will be found of unusual interest. If properly studied they cannot fail to be highly suggestive and profitable helps in the preparation of sermons. Much valuable instruction of various kinds may also be gleaned from them. One more volume will complete the series. The value of each volume, however, is independent of the others.

PULPIT AND PLATFORM: Sermons and Addresses. By Rev. O. H. Tiffany, D. D., LL. D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893. Price \$1.25.

This volume is made up of twelve sermons and four addresses. Among the subjects discussed in the sermons are, Oratory, the Preparation in Study, the Cross, Thanksgiving, Christmas, the New Birth, the Things which are Caesar's, the Silence of Christ, and a Woman's Influence. The addresses are on Abraham Lincoln, Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant, American National Character as affected by Immigration, and the Yosemite Valley. Both sermons

and addresses will be found of a highly interesting character, and will repay study. They deserve to be published, and are worthy a place in every clergyman's library.

ANNOTATIONS UPON POPULAR HYMNS. By Charles Seymour Robinson, D. D., Editor and Compiler of "Songs of the Church," 1862; "Songs of the Sanctuary," 1866; "Psalms and Hymns," 1876; "Spiritual Songs," 1878; "Laudes Domini," 1884; "New Laudes Domini, 1892." For use in praise meetings. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price \$2.50.

This volume, the author tells us in the preface, has grown slowly through a period of years, and has been prepared specially as a help for "Praise Meetings," or so-called "Services of Song." It contains annotations upon more than a thousand of the best known hymns in our language. In these annotations much interesting and edifying information is given concerning the authors of these hymns, and the circumstances under which they were prepared. Portraits of many of the hymn-writers are also given, which afford matter for entertaining study. The work is indeed in every respect a truly valuable one. Much may be learned from it, which, if rightly used, will add materially to the interest of religious services of all kinds. It ought accordingly to have a place in every minister's library.

THE STUDENT'S COMMENTARY. A COMPLETE HERMENEUTICAL MANUAL ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. By James Strang, S. T. D., LL. D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price \$2.00.

This commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes consists of a corrected Hebrew text, an ample critical apparatus, a free but terse metrical rendering, a modernized and rhythmically arranged translation, an extended introduction, a detailed tabular analysis, the authorized version amended, the American revised version, a closely literal paraphrase, a copious, logical, exegetical and practical exposition, and full lexical, grammatical and vindicatory notes. It contains, therefore, everything, apart from lexicon and grammar, which is necessary to the most thorough study of the book. Such is indeed its richness of matter that it is really adapted, as the author designed it should be, to readers, preachers and scholars of every stage of progress and of all denominations. Of the commentaries on Ecclesiastes with which we are acquainted, it is the most satisfactory and generally useful. It ought to be in demand therefore, especially among scholars and theological students.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES ON THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON FOR 1894. By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893. Price \$1.25.

This volume is a guide to the study of the Sunday-school lessons for the year just begun. It gives for the benefit of those who would

thoroughly acquaint themselves with these lessons, original and selected comments, methods of teachings, illustrative stories, practical applications, notes on Eastern life, library references, maps, tables, pictures and diagrams. Of the various books of this kind which are annually published, it is one of the very best. Those who will furnish themselves with it and make its contents a careful study, can scarcely fail to understand the different lessons for the year, and to be admirably equipped to impart instruction with regard to them. We commend the work to Sunday-school teachers generally. All such will find it a very valuable help.

LIFE'S BATTLE WON. By Julia A. W. De Witt, author of "How He Made His Fortune," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893. Price \$1.50.

This story is said to be substantially true, and therefore something more than a mere creation of the imagination. Its aim is to show what can be accomplished by the patient and persevering efforts of an earnest Christian. Written in an attractive and entertaining style, it is well suited for the family and the Sunday-school library. Both younger persons and those of more advanced years will find the reading of it interesting and profitable. It is a book that ought to be in demand, especially in the Sunday-school.

THOUGHTS ON GOD AND MAN. Selections from the Works of Frederick William Robertson, of "Brighton." Edited by Joseph B. Burroughs, M. D. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893. Price \$1.00.

These "Thoughts" have been selected from the published sermons of Rev. F. W. Robertson who, we think, may properly be called the most brilliant preacher of the nineteenth century. One selection is given for each day of the year, and each selection is prefaced by a text of Scripture. The selections or "thoughts," will prove an admirable introduction to the sermons themselves from which they are taken. No one can read them without benefit, and those who do read them, will desire to read all that their gifted author wrote, if they have not already done so.

A PHYSICIAN'S NOTES ON APOSTOLIC TIMES (the Acts of the Apostles). By Rev. S. V. Robinson. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893. Price 20 cents.

*This booklet forms part of "The Book of Books Series." Though not as striking a treatise as some of the other numbers of the series, it is nevertheless well written and will repay study. Rev. Robinson does not enter into any of the critical questions connected with the Acts of the Apostles, but simply calls attention to some of the great truths which this portion of Scripture sets forth and illustrates. "This book," he truly says, "is pre-eminently instruc-

tive on the ministry of the Holy Spirit. The Gospels tell us how Jesus lived, what He taught, the work He 'began to do,' how He died and rose again. The Acts show us the activities of the risen Lord through the ministry of the divine Spirit. It is the Acts of the Holy Spirit in Apostolic Times."

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D. D., minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Vol. xxii. John. New York: Funk & Wagnall's Company, London and Toronto. 1893. Price \$1.50.

We have here another volume of the People's Bible. Only two more volumes remain to be published. To attempt the production of such an extended work was a great undertaking, which now promises to be successfully achieved. The present volume, like those which have preceded it, abounds in brilliant and striking statements. In it the central truths of the Gospel of St. John are brought out, explained, illustrated and applied with great skill and power. One of the most startling features of the volume is the view advanced by Dr. Parker, that Judas was truly repentant and will probably be among the saved. Those who have the other volumes of the series will of course want this volume also.

OUR NEED OF PHILOSOPHY. An Appeal to the American People. By Paul Carns. An Address delivered on August 24, 1893, before the World's Congress of Philosophy at Chicago, Ill.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. By Paul Carns 1893 Price in paper 25 cents. Extra Edition, 50 cents.

Both the above publications come to us from the OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY, OF CHICAGO, ILL., and commend themselves as fruit of earnest thought.

What Dr. Carns says about our need of philosophy is deserving of serious consideration. With him we believe that, "By introducing certain ideas into men's minds you determine their doings and omissions. As people think, so they feel; and as they feel, so they act. Our conceptions lie at the bottom of our sentiments, and our sentiments determine our attitude in life."

The Religion of Science, as presented by Dr. Carns, contains undoubted elements of truth. As a whole, however, it is not satisfactory. The religion of true science and the religion of Jesus we feel assured in the end will be found to be one and the same. The views, however, which Dr. Carns entertains concerning the soul and immortality, in our opinion are not at all the views entertained by Jesus and taught in the Christian Scriptures. We need a higher philosophy and religion than that which materialism offers unto us.